VOLUME XLII NUMBER 3

THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

JULY 1949

MANA IN GREECE AND ROME . . . . . *Herbert Jennings Rose* 155

ARISTEAS AND III MACCABEES . . . . . *Moses Hadas* 175

LATIN TRACTATES ON PREACHING: A BOOK-LIST . . . . . *Harry Caplan and Henry H. King* 185

MONASTICS AND SECULARS UNDER YAROSLAV THE WISE . . . . . *R. P. Casey* 207

CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON : GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1949

Issued Quarterly $3.00 a Year Single Numbers $1.00

THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Issued quarterly by the Faculty of Divinity in
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Editorial Committee

ARTHUR D. NOCK
WILLARD L. SPERRY — HENRY J. CADBURY
J. A. C. F. AUER — WILLIAM THOMSON

The *Harvard Theological Review* is maintained on the foundation established under the will of Mildred Everett, daughter of Charles Carroll Everett, Bussey Professor of Theology in Harvard University, 1869–1900, and Dean of the Faculty of Divinity, 1878–1900.

The scope of the Review embraces theology, ethics, the history and philosophy of religion, and cognate subjects. It aims to publish investigations, discussions, and reviews which contribute to the enlargement of knowledge or the advance of thought.

Remittances and communications on business matters should be addressed to the *Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.*

PUBLISHED BY THE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
PUBLISHERS OF THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

LONDON: GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Entered as second-class mail matter January 2, 1908, at the post-office at Boston, Mass. under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special postage rate provided for by Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 31, 1918.

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XLII JULY, 1949 NUMBER 3

MANA IN GREECE AND ROME *

HERBERT JENNINGS ROSE
UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND

THERE CAN be little doubt that of all the services rendered by the late Rector to learning the most widely known is his introduction to anthropologists and comparative religionists of the concept of *mana*. The debates excited by his short and modest survey of the matter, just before the beginning of this century,[1] have not yet died down, and the "odd piece of twine" wherewith he proposed to bind certain facts together has grown into a thick rope, known by many fine names, such as preanimism, predeism, orendism and so forth, which is stoutly hauled upon by some, while others stumble over it or try to unwind it or prove that it was never really there, or at least that it has replaced something much earlier which formed an essential and legitimate part of the tackle. It is indeed a remarkable thing, on which a Hellenistic philosopher might have founded a thoughtful treatise on the inscrutable ways of Chance, that that one lecture and its unassuming successors raised such a pother, whereas the much longer, more elaborate and by no means unlearned or ill-reasoned work of J. H. King, only eight years earlier,[2] fell still-born from the press and owes its reintroduction to science to the bitter opponent of all such theories of the origin of religion, the redoubtable Father Wilhelm Schmidt. Fortunately, it is not needful that I should attempt to review the controversy in this short survey of one corner of the vast field of Comparative Religion. Let man's attempts to conceive of the supernatural begin with animism, primitive monotheism, weather-lore or what you will, I

* The Marett Lecture, delivered on June 5, 1948, at Exeter College, Oxford. Dr. R. R. Marett was Rector of Exeter.

[1] Folk-Lore, 1900, 162–82, reprinted in The Threshold of Religion.

[2] The Supernatural, its Origin, Nature and Evolution, London and New York, 1892. See W. Schmidt, Origin and Growth of Religion, 120 sqq.

think no one will deny that the concept of *mana* is early and wide-spread, that the word itself and equivalents of it in sundry human tongues are found over a vast area of the world, and also that if we look back to the past history of civilizations living or dead, we shall find traces of it, sometimes more than mere traces. That is enough for my purpose this afternoon; I propose to look for such traces in the two classical civilizations of Europe as we know them from surviving documents.

If we begin with Greece, it must be confessed at once that ideas corresponding to *mana* are not at all prominent. The vocabulary of magic and all that has to do with it is mostly late, belonging to that strange tide of shallow mysticism and pseudo-science which set in about the beginning of the second century B.C. and continued into and past the Middle Ages. It is highly interesting and has deservedly attracted much attention, for to it are due some very striking and also some very grim phenomena and more than one long-lasting aberration of the human intelligence. But it is not characteristically nor purely Greek and owes little, if anything, to the ancestral ways of thought of the Greek people, being rather the product of the mixed civilizations which followed first upon the conquests of Alexander and then on the world-wide spread of Roman influence. I therefore neglect it in this short survey and go back instead to our earliest documents, the Homeric poems.

Here we find ourselves in a clear-eyed world which has remarkably little magic or *mana* about it. There is only one witch in the whole of the two epics, Kirke the daughter of the Sun, who although undoubtedly a god, is not one of those any normal Greek worships, and of Perse daughter of Okeanos, and own sister of Aietes, "the man of the Land," namely the land at the rainbow's end where golden fleeces and all manner of strange things are to be found. In other words, she is a foreigner from the very ends of the earth, and everybody knows that foreigners are queer and apt to be wizards and witches, if not actually devils. Also she lives on a foreign island, so far away from any familiar place that those who manage to arrive there (and only Odysseus who occasionally does things not quite falling within the activities of an Achaian gentleman, ventures so far afield) are quite los

and hardly know east from west.[3] The ghosts who once or twice play a part (one visits Achilles, another noble who is just on the verge of really good society and has a head full of strange old-fashioned notions about death and the dead, while the rest are again connected with Odysseus) seem to have no *mana* at all, and are poor things whose only wish is to have their proper rites performed so that they can get into the cheerless house of the Unseen One, or, being there, to be given a drink of warm blood to put back a little life into them for a few moments. Those beings whom one would expect to have the greatest share of *mana*, the gods who, in a vague sort of way, "can do everything" [4] have very little about them which is mysterious or not possessed, in however small a degree, by ordinary human beings. Now and then, it is true, they show traces of the magical powers which, for instance, Egyptian deities possess in large measure. Athena, who like her fellows can change her own shape whenever she likes, can also change the shape of human beings. When she does so, she proceeds in proper witch fashion, using a conjuror's rod,[5] exactly as Kirke does when she turns the sailors into swine. But Poseidon, when he rescues Aineias from imminent death at the hands of Achilles,[6] acts in all respects save one like a man who sees a child in danger and lifts him out of it.

"Then did he straightway pour darkness over the eyes of Achilles Peleus' son; and the ash spear with its good bronze point he drew out of high-hearted Aineias' shield and laid it before Achilles' feet, but Aineias he raised high above the ground and sped him away. Many ranks of gentles and their horses did Aineias overleap, impelled by the hand of the god, and he came to the extreme verge of the noisy battle, where the Kaukones were doing on their harness to go to fight. And Poseidon Earthshaker drew near him and spake winged words, saying, 'Aineias, who bade thee fly in the face of the gods and meet haughty Peleus' son face to face in battle? He is mightier than thou and dearer to the Deathless Ones. Nay, withdraw when thou meetest him, lest thou go before thy time to the house of the Unseen One. But when

[3] κ 190–92, which I take to be a stock saying like our phrase "to lose one's bearings." I doubt if Homer would think of a "hexenhaft verzauberte Landschaft," as a romantically inclined modern might, cf. K. Kerényi, Töchter der Sonne, 73.

[4] κ 306.

[5] ν 429, cf. κ 238.

[6] Υ 321 sqq.

Achilles is gone to his death and doom, then take courage and fight among the foremost, for no other of the Achaians shall be thy bane.' "

We may, after the fashion of an Alexandrian poet, transport the scene to a purely human environment. An adult sees a little boy in danger of being bullied by a larger one; he keeps the would-be bully away and "jumps" the intended victim over the heads of other children playing near, then puts him down in a safe place, scolds him mildly and advises him in future not to fight a boy bigger than himself. The action of the god has nothing mysterious about it, unless it be the "darkness" which blinds Achilles' eyes for the moment, but he does everything on a bigger scale than would be possible for a man, and does it much better. It is no more uncanny than the huge strides he takes when he is in a hurry.[7] Even Apollo, who as he favors foreigners (for whatever reason) has something a little strange about him, especially when he is angry and "goes like the night," [8] is no magician. He wants to avenge the wrong done to his priest, so he shoots a divine equivalent of poisoned arrows at the Achaian camp, killing beasts and men.[9] So, on a much smaller scale, might a human sniper, a Paris or a Teukros. When he finds Troy threatened before her due time by the onslaught of Patroklos,[10] he puts his hands against the hero's shield and fairly thrusts him away, finally warning him to desist. So again might an adult put aside a troublesome small boy and, if that did not suffice, speak to him sharply enough to make an impression. And so with one divine intervention after another; the god acts with greater strength, speed and general efficiency than any man possesses, but there is nothing mysterious about it, nothing, even, irresistible to the weaker human force, for not only Aphrodite but Ares has to drop out of the fight wounded by Diomedes,[11] who is indeed helped by Athena, but in no magical way, once one accepts it that a god need not be visible unless he chooses; Athena catches Ares' spearshaft in her

[7] See N 20.

[8] A 47.

[9] A 50–52; for arrow-poison, which is not a thing a gentleman uses in battle, cf. α 261 sqq. What Odysseus there wanted it for is not stated, but Telemachos takes his use of it as a matter of course.

[10] π 702 sqq.

[11] E 330 sqq., 846 sqq.

hand and turns the thrust aside, then helps Diomedes to drive his point home into the god's flank.

Indeed, there are but two Greek deities of any importance whose activities are of the mysterious, *mana*-ful kind so familiar to many peoples. Of these, Hekate becomes what she is in classical times by a process of degeneration, apparently, for in Hesiod (or an early interpolator of him) she is respectable enough,[12] powerful by grace of Zeus and giver of quite normal blessings. Hermes on the other hand has his conjuror's wand from the earliest times of which we have any documentary evidence, and art does not confuse it, as literature on occasion does, with his herald's staff.[13] It is to be noted that although a popular, he is quite a minor deity, and rises to no great heights of moral or political development.[14]

To find *mana*, then, among the better classes of society, gods and nobles, in classical Greece, we must look almost in holes and corners. I have elsewhere [15] stated that I think Zeus bears some faint traces of a time when he was nothing more than sky-*mana*; but that simple condition lies a long way behind the Father of gods and men as Homer knew him, and the upholder of righteousness in whom Hesiod and Aeschylus believed. If we look at one or two humbler gods and perhaps a few out-of-the-way cults of the greater ones, we may find a little *mana* still left, however. Pan seems to have had some, which on occasion needed stirring up. If you will grant my prayer, says Simichidas in Theokritos,[16]

"dear Pan, may Arkadian boys never whip you with squills under your flanks and shoulders when they have but little meat."

What they whipped was no doubt a statue of the god, probably of no very finished or artistic workmanship, or perhaps merely a sort of herm with his head indicated at the top of it. And the instrument they used has its parallels in other ancient rites of a magical nature. When Ionian cities used a human scapegoat,

[12] Hesiod, Theog. 411 sqq.

[13] See F. J. M. de Waele, The Magic Staff or Rod in Graeco-Italian Antiquity (1927), 29 sqq.

[14] L. R. Farnell, C.G.S., v, 30.

[15] The Wiro Sky-God, in Custom is King, 51 sqq.

[16] Theokritos vii, 106–8.

part of the ritual was to beat him with "squills, wild figs and other plants that grow wild."[17] The squill was also used in purificatory rites; Theophrastos' δεισιδαίμων regards it as equally efficacious with a puppy for getting rid of the bad effects of seeing something which the corrupt text will not let us identify,[18] and Dion Chrysostom recommends purging a city, not with water or squills but with a cleaner thing, the use of the reason.[19] It seems therefore that the whipping of Pan was a twofold rite; the beating would stir up the good *mana* in him, the purgative plant would get the bad *mana* which was hindering his activities out.

But if, continuing our search, we leave the company of gods or even godlings and come down to the level of the peasant-proprietor, there is rather more *mana* to be found. Hesiod has a fair amount of it about the country-side of that unpleasant place, Askra. There was apparently no inconsiderable *mana*, respectively good and bad, in a festival of the Olympian gods and in a funeral. At all events, the very best time to beget a child (all that has to do with sex is heavily charged with *mana*, some of it at least very dangerous) is on returning from "a feast of the Deathless Ones," and to attempt it after visiting a grave is highly inadvisable.[20] This is quite intelligible. One wants the child to live long and prosper; if at the very beginning of his existence he can be given a sort of flavor of immortality and blessedness, that ought to conduce to the desirable result, but if his father has about him even a trace of the *mana* of death and the underworld, what can be expected save a sickly, short-lived, perhaps still-born baby? At the same time, the *mana* of the gods is not a thing to trifle with. The wise man will not cut his nails at their festivals, nor even, it would seem, speak of doing such a thing, for Hesiod couches his grave warning in oracular language, not to say tabu-speech:[21]

"At the lusty banquet of the gods, cut not with gleaming iron dry from green from that which has five branches."

[17] Tzetzes, Chibiades v, 734, *σκίλλαις συκαῖς ἀγρίαις τε καὶ ἄλλοις τῶν ἀγρίων.*

[18] Theophrastos, Char. 16, 14.

[19] Dion Chrysostom (Dion Prusaensis), xlviii, 17, *περικαθήραντας τὴν πόλιν μὴ σκίλλῃ μηδὲ ὕδατι, πολὺ δὲ καθαρωτέρῳ χρήματι τῷ λόγῳ.*

[20] Hesiod, O.D. 735–6.

[21] Ibid., 742–3.

Long after, it was put on record that to tempt the gods is as bad as committing the evil deed which they are vainly asked to approve.[22] No doubt, when the Pythia said that to the tardily repentant Glaukos, she was voicing the advanced morality of Apollo; but she had behind her the older feeling that to mention anything is very like touching it. To leave one's nail-parings lying about when the air is heavy-laden with *mana* that may be dangerous (for if the one who wounded can also heal, the healer and giver of good things can also harm; all divinities are apt to be bipolar, or ambivalent, to use modern catch-words); therefore to speak plainly of doing so is not without its perils. It may be that the riddling language is not due entirely to the poet's own beliefs, but belongs to the tradition of his art; how much, indeed, do we know of the influences other than Homeric which affected him? But if so, this removes the belief in *mana* somewhat further back in time, but by no means does away with its existence.

Leaving Hesiod, although several more instances might be cited from him, let us glance at the strange jumble of superstitions which lay on the outskirts of Pythagoreanism, the notorious *symbola*,[23] which in plain Polynesian are tabus. Some of them agree with Hesiod's maxims, for instance, to the prohibition of paring one's nails on a feast-day is added the further proscription of cutting one's hair; the reason is plainly the same. Some are extremely obscure; I have never been able to find a satisfactory reason why one should not sit down on a *choinix*, for example, unless it be that it is used for measuring grain and that is too holy to be polluted by coming into the remotest contact with what St. Paul (or rather the A.V.) delicately calls the uncomely parts of the human body. If that is so, it is parallel to the prohibition against eating off a chair. In other cases, however, it is quite obvious why certain actions are objectionable. No one should kill a louse in a holy place; this is nothing but an extreme example of avoiding anything which suggests death there, other than the death of a sacrificial victim, which I fancy is not so much a killing as the transference of a life from profane to

[22] Herodotos, vi, 86 γ, ζ.

[23] F. Boehm, De symbolis Pythagoreis, diss., Berlin 1905. My examples are his Nos. 49, 32, 38, 6 and 61, in that order.

sacred use. Even so low and vile a creature as the parasite has or may have a kind of evil *mana* about it, and this, released or intensified by its death, may work against the good *mana* of the god or his shrine. Another tabu I mention partly because I think Boehm has misunderstood it. It rests on quite good authority and forbids the Pythagorean to help anyone lower his load to the ground, while allowing him to help put it up on the bearer's shoulder (*φορτίον μὴ συγκαθαιρεῖν, συνανατιθέναι δέ*). The latter act may be no more than a piece of courtesy or kindness; the former is avoided, I think, for fear of contact with so undesirable a quality as the weariness which naturally follows on carrying a burden for any distance.

Thus to find *mana* in pre-Hellenistic Greece we have had to look in no very reputable quarters, for I cannot believe that Pythagoreans of the calibre of Philolaos or Archytas regulated their lives by such rules as those I have quoted; if they were vegetarians, that is another matter, and an intelligible practical corollary to their theory of reincarnation. Further examination would doubtless find traces here and there, in such things as old ritual rules grown unintelligible by lapse of time and alteration of opinions, of the idea of *mana* which had once existed, but would not, I think, alter the general impression which most careful students seem to form, that there was not much left of the "orendistic" type of mind. It is a different matter when we move to ancient Italy. To begin with, there is a Latin word meaning something very like *mana*, namely *numen*, which has of late furnished Professor Wagenvoort with material for a most ingenious book.[24] I shall have no scruples in borrowing from him to furnish illustrations for the rest of this lecture; but he naturally is not responsible for such conclusions as I may draw, there being, here as in so many other departments of scholarship, abundant room for reasonable and friendly difference of opinion. But let us begin by contrasting two corresponding figures, a Homeric king and a Roman *imperator*, whether king or consul.

Homer, as everyone who has looked into him knows, has a

[24] Imperium: studiën over het "Mana"-begrip in zede en taal der Romeinen (Amsterdam, 1941). Revised and somewhat enlarged English edition, Roman Dynamism: Studies in ancient Roman thought, language and custom (Oxford 1947), from which I quote.

famous description of the prosperity attending a righteous and godfearing monarch. He says [25]

"A noble king who, fearing the gods, rules among many mighty men and upholdeth righteous judgments; the black earth brings forth wheat and barley and the trees are heavy with fruit, and the flocks still have increase and the sea yields fish by reason of his well-doing, and the folk prosper under their lord."

Now this may be and has been taken as an example of royal *mana*,[26] but if this is so, that idea has receded very far into the background and left no mark on the language. The prosperity comes from the gods, whom the king fears and who reward his good deeds. It is the ancient and naïve view of divine recompense; *non uidi iustum derelictum nec semen eius quaerens panem.* Hesiod [27] makes the same result follow from the practice of justice in the community at large, with no mention of kings or leading men of any kind, except that it is to be gathered that they follow the good example of the rest. Now contrast a Roman war-leader, as Wagenvoort sees him.[28]

Putting on one side numerous subsidiary questions, some of them interesting and important for the understanding of Rome, there is no doubt that an *imperator* is one who does something "in" something or someone, as the godling Imporcitor is the one who sees to it that the *porcae*, "nogsbacks," or ridges between the furrows, duly appear in the ploughed fields.[29] The question is what he does and in whom. Wagenvoort adopts the very plausible etymology of F. Müller, that the second syllable comes from the root of *parere*, *imperare* being thus the same kind of formation as *occupare*. It will therefore mean "to beget in . . ."

[25] *τ* 109 sqq.

[26] Cf. A. M. Hocart in Man xxiv (1924), 54.

[27] Hesiod, O.D. 225 sqq. Opinions had really changed very little between Hesiod's date and the reign of Zenon, A.D. 474–91. That enlightened emperor hopes officially (Euagrios, Hist. Eccl. iii, 14, p. 111, 25–30 Bidez-Parmentier) that if his empire remains unitedly orthodox *τὰ μὲν τῶν πολεμίων ἐκτριβήσεται καὶ ἐξαλειφθήσεται γένη, πάντες δὲ τὸν οἰκεῖον ὑποκλινοῦσιν αὐχένα τῷ ἡμετέρῳ μετὰ θεὸν κράτει, εἰρήνη δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐκ ταύτης ἀγαθὰ ἀέρων τε εὐκρασία καὶ καρπῶν εὐφορία καὶ τὰ ἄλλα δὲ τὰ λυσιτελοῦντα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις φιλοτιμηθήσεται.*

[28] Rom. Dynamism, 69 sq.

[29] Festus (Paulus) 96, 3 Lindsay: Imporcitor, qui porcas in agro facit arando. porca autem est inter duos sulcos terra eminens.

someone; for the objection that *parere* in classical Latin does not mean "beget" but "bear" is countered by the fact that *parens* is much oftener masculine than feminine. But even if this etymology is wrong, and the more orthodox one correct, that an *imperator* is one who *parat* or makes ready something in somebody, the main argument is not affected. A Roman chief of old days made it his business either to beget or to make ready something in those under his command, and we must ask what the something was. Wagenvoort suggests that it was his own *mana*, the *mana* which every chief possesses in greater or smaller degree, and therefore that the familiar phrase *militibus imperat ut hostem aggrediantur* originally meant "puts his *mana* into the soldiers so that they charge the enemy." He may be right; it is, however, also possible that what he puts into them is war-*mana*, produced for the occasion by the ceremonies which he knows how to perform. For that there were such ceremonies is clear enough from the ritual of the Salii. Priests of Mars or Quirinus or of the old triad of Juppiter, Mars and Quirinus[30] in historical times, they need not have been priests of anyone to begin with. They were men of good families, they were dressed and armed in the style of the Bronze Age, and their business was to dance war-dances. It is true that these, in the epochs covered by our documents, were on fixed occasions regulated by the State calendar, but I very much doubt if this was so originally; it seems much more likely that they performed their rite whenever it was needed, that is, when war-magic and war-*mana* were desirable because the State was attacking or attacked. What rôle their female counterparts, the *Saliae uirgines*, originally played we are not informed. In historical times they were hirelings, presumably recruited when wanted by the ecclesiastical authorities. It does not appear that they helped to "move the *ancilia*," as the war dance of the male Salii was officially called, but even in historical times they dressed more or less like warriors and performed some kind of rite in the Regia under the guidance of a pontiff, probably the Pontifex Maximus.[31] It is therefore a reasonable conjecture that

[30] References in Wissowa, RKR, 555; for Salii outside Rome see the Oxford Classical Dictionary, s.u.

[31] Festus, 439, 18 Lindsay: Salias uirgines Cincius ait esse conducticias quae ad Salios adhibeantur cum apicibus paludatas, quas Aelius Stilo scripsit sacrificium

originally they were the wives, sisters and mothers of the fighting men, who in their absence on campaign went to the abode of the king and there did such things as seemed to them most likely to help their men endure the hardships of campaigning and overcome their enemies when they met them, as the women of sundry peoples have done down to fairly recent dates in different parts of the world.[32] With dances performed by the warriors themselves and rites, whatever their exact nature may have been, enacted by the women it is plain that plenty of good war-*mana* was available for the primitive Roman *imperator*, and it remained only for him to put it into his followers by whatever machinery was then in vogue. Down to Imperial times, following old custom, he was formally hailed as *imperator* by his troops only when he had given practical proof, by defeating his foes, that he really was one, and no mere pretender to such powers.[33]

Turning from such exalted persons as kings and war-leaders, I wish to discuss a puzzling ceremony known to us only from a legend in which it is embodied. When Horatius was pardoned for his rash killing of his sister, he still had to be purified, and the method adopted was as follows, according to Livy and Dionysios of Halikarnassos.[34] After certain sacrifices, to Iuno Sororia and to Ianus Curiatius, "which," says Livy, "were henceforth entrusted to the clan of the Horatii," i.e., were part of their *sacra gentilicia*, Horatius, with his head covered, was led under a beam fixed across the narrow street leading from the Carinae to the Vicus Cuprius, none other, it would seem, than the notorious Vicus Sceleratus,[35] in other words Ill-luck Wynd, for we need not, I suppose, spend time over the artificial legend which found out a "sin" after which the thoroughfare, otherwise called the Cliuus Orbius, might be supposed to have been called. Both Livy and Dionysios draw attention to the resemblance between this ceremony and the passing of a defeated army under the "yoke."

---

facere in Regia cum pontifice paludatas cum apicibus in modum Saliorum. I would delete *paludatas cum apicibus.*

[32] Examples in GB i, 126 sqq.

[33] Wagenvoort, op. cit., 60 sqq.

[34] Livy i, 26, 12–13; Dion. Hal., Antiquit. iii, 6–7.

[35] See Kiepert-Huelsen, Formae Urbis Romae Antiquae, map I, Ko; Platner-Ashby, Topographical Dict. of Anc. Rome, art. Cliuus Orbius.

Now, apart from the strange views of G. Dumézil, with which I have dealt elsewhere,[36] I take it that little doubt exists regarding the origin of the romantic tale of the two sets of triplets, the Horatii and the Curiatii, and how they fought to determine the relative position of their respective cities, Rome and Alba Longa. Its ultimate foundations are a few ancient monuments, a group of five tombs, the *pila Horatia*, on which hung, it would seem, certain old spoils, the altars of Iuno Sororia and Ianus Curiatius, and the *tigillum sororium* itself, the "beam of the sister," as it was popularly interpreted. Given these materials, a tale was needed which should introduce deaths, ritual somehow connected with someone's sister, the name of the Horatii, whose rite and perhaps whose legend it was, and an explanation of the title Curiatius. Jurists took the story up and made it into the ideal hard case; Horatius, killing his sister for an unpatriotic act, has all law against him, all patriotic feeling for him. The natural and only way out of the difficulty is to satisfy the law by condemning and sentencing him, feelings by exercising the people's sovran prerogative of mercy on his behalf, and *fas* by putting him through some ritual which shall get rid of his uncleanness and make him for sacral purposes no longer a shedder of kindred blood. But it does not follow from all this that anything but free imagination played on the venerable relics around which the story grew up, that any of them had anything to do with purification from homicide or that a sister, or indeed any woman, was connected with the affair. Let us start where the story started with the monuments. The tombs we may pretty safely neglect. They were somewhere outside the *pomerium*, within five Roman miles and on the side towards Alba.[37] It is therefore unlikely that they can have much to do with a ceremonial conducted within the city limits. We are left with the altars and the beam together with a sufficiently clear indication that someone sometimes was led under that beam *capite adoperto*, that is with the usual precaution of putting something over his head and ears to shut out ill-omened sights and sounds.

Starting from the name of the beam and the title of the goddess

[36] J.R.S. xxxvii (1947), 185.
[37] Livy i, 26, 11; 23, 3; 25, 14.

I have long held to and now like better than ever the etymology suggested to me by Professor J. Whatmough.[38] The word has nothing whatever to do with *soror*, a sister, but is derived from the same root as English *swell*, German *schwellen*. It is connected with the rare verb *sororiare*, preserved to us in a fragment, allegedly of Plautus, cited in Festus: [39] *tunc papillae primulum/ fraterculabant, illud uolui dicere/sororiabant*. The speaker, probably a woman, is giving a detail of the time when something occurred, perhaps the kidnapping of the usual long-lost daughter on whom so many plots turn. It was when

> "The breasts were brothering, no, I mean to say
> Sistering."

No doubt the writer, whether Plautus or another, was content to associate the word somehow with *soror* and make his pun on it in the shape of the nonsense-word *fraterculabant*.[40] But that it is used of the most obvious sign of adolescence, the increase in size of the sex-organs, is clear and is confirmed by the ancient definitions which we have. I think I have found reason to believe that both sexes can be said *sororiare* or to be *sororii*, and that this explains the extraordinary statement that in the rites of Mater Matuta women prayed for their sisters' children and not their own; they asked, I think, for blessings on *pueri sororii*, adolescent boys and girls. Now if this is so, the *tigillum sororium* is the beam of adolescents and Iuno Sororia the goddess who looks after them and promotes their growth. That those subjected to the ritual did go under the beam with their heads covered I see no reason to doubt; it may be, if we pay so much attention to the legend, that only the boys of the Gens Horatia did so. If the names of the streets are as old as the rite, they may have been selected as the appropriate places for it to be performed. Whatever the name of

[38] See Mnemosyne liii, 407 sqq., C.Q. xxviii, 157.

[39] Festus 380, 25 sqq.: sororiare mammae dicuntur puellarum, cum primum tumescunt, ut fraterculare puerorum. Plautus in Friuolaria d.....papillae pri.....uolui dicere, so...Paulus' extract from the passage contains the quotation unmutilated and nearly right.

[40] That it is a nonsense-word invented for the sake of the joke ought to be clear, but was not so to some ancient lexicographers, including it would seem Verrius Flaccus himself. For the dreams which such men dreamed see Lindsay's larger edition of Festus (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1930), p. 209, art. *fratrare*.

the Cliuus Orbius originally meant, to a Roman ear it surely would suggest *orbus* and *orbitas*, the undesirable childless state, for when such customs were first introduced no one dreamed that it would ever be profitable to have a fortune and no children to leave it to, but only an informal retinue of legacy-hunters to make life comfortable in its decline with presents and flatteries. Passing under the holy Beam of Increase, or of Adolescence, they would come in a few yards to the Vicus Cuprius, which we may safely assume has nothing to do with Cyprus or its goddess (her worship was still far in the future) but is rather Good Street.[41] What exactly had happened when they went under the beam? It may of course be that they simply scraped off the condition of childhood, or retarded growth, or whatever it was that they wanted to leave behind. But with the powerful aid of the two altars, one sacred to Iuno of the Adolescents, or Iuno of Growth, the other to the mighty god of gates and so of beginnings and new stages, of threshold rites in short, is it not likely that the beam and perhaps also the very walls into which it was fitted were heavily charged with positive *mana*, with the right sort of *numen* to make the Horatian boys into vigorous and well-grown men? Such an apparatus would do no harm to people who passed up and down the narrow ways on their ordinary business: if it had any effect, it would have a good one, tending to make the younger ones grow faster, while those who were already full-grown would simply feel nothing. But probably the *numen* would in any case be quiescent until it was stirred up with the appropriate ceremonial. If we ask how the idea got about that the beam was first used for the *expiatio* of a homicide, I think the question can be answered. Here was an ancient piece of wood whose name sounded as if it meant the Beam of the Sister. Here was a rite in which no one's sister took part. Therefore someone connected with the Gens Horatia had needed to undergo what looked like a piacular ceremony at a time when his sister was nowhere about. Was it not likely, then, that he had killed her and was undergoing purification for it? But if he had been left alive to

[41] Varro, L.L. v, 159, nam ciprum (*sic*) Sabine bonum. Read *cuprum*, cf. the Umbrian and Picene goddess Cupra and the city Cupra maritima which was named after her. She was evidently the Good One, cf. the Bona Dea and the Agathos Theos near Megalopolis in Arkadia, Paus. viii, 36, 5.

go through the ceremony and was not hanging from an *infelix arbor*, he must have had very good reasons for killing her; and so the other elements of the story could find a place.

I have spoken of Ianus. I do not pretend to have mastered all the ramifications of this strange god's cult, nor to be ready with a complete theory of his date, origins and development. In particular, I do not know what his title Curiatius means; Klausen's idea that he was god of the *curiae* [42] may have something in it. If it is right, it may be that the appropriateness of the particular cult which we have been discussing was that the Horatian boys who had been through the ceremony were thereby fitted to become active members of that *curia* to which their family belonged, in fact that the whole business corresponded to the Athenian ritual of the Apaturia which left the young members of the appropriate families members also of the phratry to which their fathers belonged. But all this is little better than guesswork, and it is more pertinent to remember that threshold-rites have a vast deal of *mana* about them. I need not labor the point, for it was made long ago by van Gennep, though I think he does not discuss Ianus in Les Rites de Passage. It is well known that the ancients, when they became fully articulate and had got so far as to discuss at length the nature of Roman gods, were frankly puzzled by this strange figure. Ovid is quite outspoken about him: Greece has no similar deity, he says, and thereby implies that there is no room for the natural and straightforward explanation of him and his functions which sufficed for such gods as Juppiter or Mars.[43] He is probably echoing the doubts which Verrius Flaccus had felt. Now, since Ianus is the god of gates (I have no room here to discuss the attempts to connect him with Diana, but content myself with remarking that no such figure as Dianus occurs in Roman cult, and without him the whole construction falls to the ground), one would have thought that a theorist would have remembered the Greek gods who protect the entrance to the house and contented himself with supposing that Ianus was Apollo Agyieus, or Hermes or even a male doublet of Hekate. But in fact no identification ever gained general acceptance, and

[42] R. H. Klausen, Aeneas und die Penaten (1840), 714.
[43] Ovid, Fasti, i, 90.

the attitude taken up by Ovid and his authority was the most usual one. The reason, I think, lies in the point which I have tried to make throughout this lecture; *mana* was a nearly forgotten idea in Greece, but almost on the surface in Italy. Ianus was the *numen* of the outer gate or door. That is why he is so much more important than the other deities of doors, such as Forculus. *Fores* may lead almost anywhere, perhaps merely from one room to another, and certainly not into and out of anything so important as a city. They are properly the panels of the door, not the comparatively imposing framework of a gate; but a *ianua* leads to and from the outer world of street or field, a *ianus* is the barbican which gives admission through the city wall, or lets the citizens out on grave public business such as wars, when they should remember that there is a right and a wrong way of going through; the Fabii died to a man when they passed through the right-hand *ianus* of the Porta Carmentalis.[44] The gate is heavily charged with *numen*, and that perhaps is why Ianus never has a satisfactory humanized shape, only the two-faced head which is a crude attempt to make the two-ways passage come alive, and never finds a body really suitable to it. Ianus was not so much a god as a potency, which remained so important that it resisted the changes brought about by Hellenization and lived on to puzzle Roman theorists and reduce so intelligent a Greek as Dionysios to saying (one can almost see the shrug of his shoulders as he writes it down) that he was "some local god or other supernatural being known as Ianos."[45] For this particular patch of *numen* spread beyond the limits of the gate or street door and is to be found in rather unexpected places. *Iana* was one of the titles of the Moon-goddess; this rests on no theoretical identification but on a country saying recorded by Varro. It meant especially the moon of the eighth day[46] and was important, because everyone knew very well that some things on earth waxed and waned as the moon did, and therefore it was best to wait till

[44] Livy ii, 49, 8: infelici uia, dextro iano portae Carmentalis, profecti (Fabii) ad Cremeram flumen perueniunt.

[45] ἐπιχωρίου θεοῦ τινος ἢ δαίμονος Ἰανοῦ λεγομένου, Ant. iii, 7, p. 313, 7 Jacoby.

[46] Varro, R.R. i, 36, 3: nusquam rure audisti, inquit, octauo Ianam lunam ..... quaedam melius fieri post octauo Ianam lunam quam ante? I found nothing on Tertullian, ad nat. ii, 15, for the text there is uncertain.

after Iana Luna to perform some operations on the farm. Ianus has of course no sex, only gender, and so very easily becomes feminine when brought into conjunction with a feminine substantive; for the moon, being visible, has a properly substantival name which will not alter. Iana Luna is, I feel pretty well convinced, the Gateway Moon, the Moon of Entrance or Beginning; not the beginning of the month, for the new moon is well past, but of work, some particular sort of work, such as planting, which needs her influence and therefore has waited awhile, lest the power of the faint new crescent should not be enough, but not of course so long that she is on the wane and therefore giving out the wrong kind of *numen*. Ianus, however, tends a little to specialize into a god of the calendar, having the first month of the reformed (Etruscan) year named after him, or rather, it would seem, after his festival, the *ianuar* whose name was forgotten by the time Rome grew articulate, but can be recovered from the name of the month Ianuarius. This is understandable, for a year, like anything else, must have a beginning and therefore a sort of entrance gate. Now comes an interesting convergence. The moon is the natural measurer (as indeed one of her Greek names signifies and Varro noticed) [47] of the months, and we have seen that Ianus and she had something in common. But Iuno, like not a few deities who are concerned with the life of women, picked up something of a lunar character as she developed (whatever her exact development may have been, a question by no means settled). In particular, the Kalends, the day of new moon, were holy to her. Hence it is that the lunar deity and the god of all beginnings were honored at the same time, the first of every month, and hence also the title Iunonius which Ianus bore.[48] The facts are certain, the explanation has given what I must consider unnecessary trouble. There is no reason at all to consider either deity a sky-god or goddess; not that the sky has no *numen*, for of course it has, but that neither it nor the heavenly bodies have any but a secondary connection with these ancient deities. Two streams of *mana* have converged; one bore on its current the im-

[47] Varro, L.L. vi, 6, 10.

[48] Macrobius, Sat. i, 9, 16, cf. 15, 19; the former passage quotes Varro for the statement that Ianus has twelve altars, one for each month.

portant *mana* which belongs to gates, and so to threshold-rites, and so to beginnings generally; the other carried all that has to do with the life of women, and therefore all that concerns the rhythm of their life, and so something of the *mana* of that luminary which has traditionally the important function of measuring the time between conception and birth. Therefore Ianus from his gate and Iuno from her functions of guarding the mother and the child (for she is also Lucina, the good power which enables the baby to see light for the first time) reach up and touch the skies and the moon, which has so much to do with growth, with the calculation of time and not least with the periodicity of the life of women. It would seem, indeed, that the skies hung lower over ancient Italy than over ancient Greece; for in the latter country Helios and Selene are indeed gods and to be respected and occasionally saluted as such, but outside Rhodes neither has anything which could be called a cult; they are too far off and go their own ways, leaving man and his gods to go theirs. But in Rome both Sol Indiges and Luna had been worshipped from of old, although their cults were not very important, compared for instance with those of Juppiter or Mars. So it is the less to be wondered at that some kinds of terrestrial *mana* now and then impinge on the higher sphere.

In conclusion, I would mention a few traces which have been left by what seems to be the passage from belief in *mana* to worship of personal powers. We are lucky in this respect, for Roman development was checked by the inrush of foreign influences from religions which had gone much further in the direction of personalization. Therefore we have left to us several curious and interesting fossils imbedded in the mass of information regarding Roman religion. It must have occurred to early Italians that if there is something done, and *numen* implies that, there must be a doer, although at first it seems that little curiosity was felt as to his personality. For instance, it was a notable example of *numen* when a voice from nowhere warned Rome to beware of the Gauls,[49] but no one tried to identify the speaker with any known divinity; it was considered sufficient to build a chapel to Aius Locutius, the Sayer who Spoke. It is worth noting that the form

[49] Livy v, 32, 6; 50, 5.

of the name, if it can be called one, was masculine, harking back, I think, to the primitive meaning of that gender, which I take to be an agent, the feminine being an existent and the neuter something which is acted upon or is the result of action (hence its absence of a separate nominative, for originally it had and could have none). If we realize this, we shall be helped regarding several other early attempts to localize (it is hardly personalizing) *numen*, for instance, the various little godlings of the fields with their names ending in *-tor* and their masculine gender, regardless of the fact that they are of the entourage of Tellus and Ceres.[50] And especially, since we have been speaking of Iuno, it helps to explain the extraordinary fact that her name ought to be masculine, like every other Latin noun of that formation.[51] Originally, I believe, it was masculine, the possessor of *numen* who is an agent making for the provision of the things which women need, maturity, the power to bear children and so forth. Later, it was felt that a power so nearly related to women must be female, and so feminine, for sex had begun to influence gender. In like manner, the name of Venus, the "delightfulness" of a kitchen-garden which has a goodly show of pot-herbs, came to be assimilated to Tellus and Ceres in gender, though it should be neuter, because it came to be fancied that the garden-*numen*, being fertile, ought to be somehow a kind of female. It was the same sort of feeling which led in time to such formal absurdities as Terence's *mea Glycerium*,[52] the "sweetling" in question happening to be, not a spoonful of honey or the like, but a pretty girl. Greek had long before decided that the corresponding powers were females; the Charites never had any other gender than feminine and never could have had.

Now among these curious attempts to give the first adumbration of personality to the something or someone which stands behind the perceptible manifestation of *numen*, some at least are very old; we have no trace of a masculine Iuno or a neuter Venus. Are we not, then, justified in supposing that the idea of *mana* which is involved in the conception of *numen* must be older still,

[50] Fabius Pictor ap. Daniel's Servius on G. i, 21.
[51] See, e.g., Roby, Latin Grammar, i, p. 315.
[52] Terence, Andria 134.

and that the almost vanished examples of it in Greece are survivals of a very remote past? So far, then, as the classical sphere is concerned, we surely may say, not indeed that *mana* is the absolutely oldest religious idea, but that it is so ancient that with our present knowledge and any that we are likely to get in the future we can find nothing older. So perhaps those who speak of pre-animistic or predeistic ritual or conceptions in this field are not so far wrong, after all.

ARISTEAS AND III MACCABEES

MOSES HADAS
Columbia University

A certain affinity between Aristeas and III Maccabees is to be expected, for both books derive from a single environment — the Jewish community of Alexandria, both have a major purpose in common — that of setting forth the relations of the Jews to their non-Jewish rulers in as favorable a light as possible, and, most important, both are Greek books, written according to Greek canons of form; they are not, like other books on the periphery of Scripture with which they have been associated, translations from Hebrew or Aramaic, nor do they follow the forms of such works. Each is what would be called in the *progymnasmata* [1] or curriculum of the rhetoricians a διήγησις or *narratio*. Theon declares (70.25) that the canon is to be followed not only by intending rhetors but by writers in various categories; the διήγησις he defines (78.15) as λόγος ἐκθετικὸς πραγμάτων γεγονότων ἢ ὡς γεγονότων. Cicero, again without doubt following ancient principles of criticism, sets forth the difference between a continuous chronological history and a *narratio* in his invitation to Lucceius to write a treatise on his life (Ad Familiares 5.12). Whereas history serves *veritas* and *utilitas*, a *narratio* may supply *delectatio* also. The ancient canon of veracity for such treatises is clearly stated by the grammarian Asclepiades of Myrlea, in Sextus Empiricus, Adversus Grammaticos 252. Three categories of truth are set down: ἀληθὴς ἱστορία, ψευδὴς ἱστορία, and ὡς ἀληθὴς ἱστορία, or πλάσματα. The first two categories would apply to what is literally true or wholly imaginary; the third to an imaginative treatment of history which should however preserve historical verisimilitude and present a higher 'poetical' truth.[2] One thinks of Aristotle's dictum that poetry is truer than

[1] On the whole subject see G. Reichel, Quaestiones Progymnasmaticae (Leipzig, 1909). Most of what we know of *progymnasmata* derives from the rhetorician Theon, who lived in the second century A.D. but who is surely retailing traditional material. Theon is cited by page and line of C. E. Finckh, Theonis Sophistae Progymnasmata (Stuttgart, 1834).

[2] Cf. R. Reitzenstein, Hellenistische Wundererzählungen (Leipzig, 1906), 84 ff.

history (Poetics 1451b). A conscious literary artist, such as the authors of both Aristeas and III Maccabees were, might then, like the tragic poets, enhance 'historical' legends and characters by whatever means might serve a higher poetical truth, and his audience would understand that the treatment might be imaginative but that the moral or ethical burden of the piece was to be accepted seriously. The cavalier attitude to history in Aristeas and III Maccabees is not a mark of bad faith or even of faulty scholarship, but is inherent in the form they were following, and constitutes in fact a real affinity between them.

Similarities in details of language and style in the two books have frequently been noticed,[3] and it has indeed been suggested that the one is a specific refutation of the position promulgated by the other in regard to the question of the proper attitude to be taken by Egyptian Jews to their neighbors.[4] It is here proposed to examine a hypothetical point of contact not (to my knowledge) previously noticed, and to consider its implications for the dating of the two books.

In Aristeas 22–25 we are given what purport to be the actual words of the decree by which Ptolemy Philadelphus emancipated the enslaved Jews of Egypt: [5]

By the king's decree: All those who took the field with our father against the regions of Syria and Phoenicia and attacked the territory of the Jews, and became possessors of Jewish slaves, and have conveyed these into the city and the country, or it may be have sold them to others — likewise also if any such were *in the country* before then or indeed have afterwards been brought in — the owners shall forthwith release them. They are to receive at once for each slave twenty drachmas, the soldiers with their pay, and the rest from the royal bank. For we consider that to take these men prisoners was contrary to the will of our father and to what is right, and that it was owing to military rashness that their country was despoiled and the transportation of the

[3] E.g., in C. W. Emmet's Introduction to III Maccabees and H. T. Andrews' to Aristeas in Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (Oxford, 1913), and in the editions and translations of Aristeas by H. G. Meecham (The Letter of Aristeas, Manchester, 1935; The Oldest Version of the Bible, London, 1932) and R. Tramontano (La Lettera di Aristea a Filocrate, Naples, 1931).

[4] Sterling Tracy, "III Maccabees and Pseudo-Aristeas," Yale Classical Studies 1 (1928), 293–252.

[5] Translation of H. G. Meecham, The Oldest Version of the Bible (London, 1932), 18 f.

Jews into Egypt came about. For the booty gained by the soldiers on the battlefield should have sufficed. Wherefore the oppression of the men in addition was entirely unfair. Since, therefore, we profess to assign justice to all men, but still more to those who are being oppressed without reasonable grounds, and since we always seek out what is right in all cases in accordance with justice and piety, we have decreed that as many of the Jewish slaves as are at all and in whatsoever manner in bondage within the kingdom, their owners receiving the stipulated sum shall release them. No one shall be slack in discharging any of these obligations; but within three days from the day when the decree is issued they shall hand the lists to those who are appointed over these matters, and shall also produce immediately the persons. For we have decided that it is profitable for ourselves and for the realm that this matter be accomplished. Anyone who desires may give information concerning recalcitrants, on condition that he shall have the ownership of the person if found guilty, but the possessions of such persons shall be confiscated to the royal treasury.

Aristeas then adds:

When the decree was submitted to be read over to the king containing all the other clauses except "also if any such were *in the country* before then or indeed have afterwards been brought in," the king himself in his munificence and magnanimity added this clause.

A decree dealing with the registration of slaves is found on a papyrus of the Rainer collection, Inv. 24,552; its first editor, H. Liebesny,[6] attributes it to Ptolemy Philadelphus, and calls attention to its similarity to our document. Commenting upon this publication, U. Wilcken pronounced the Aristeas decree a genuine official document; [7] he had previously pointed out the keen knowledge of Ptolemaic administrative procedure displayed in its composition.[8] W. L. Westermann has called attention to compelling objections to the hypothesis that ours is a genuine decree,[9] but has demonstrated that the Aristeas decree is actually a reworking of the decree of Ptolemy Philadelphus preserved in

[6] Aegyptus 16 (1936), 257–291.

[7] Archiv für Papyrusforschung 12 (1937), 221 ff.

[8] In G. Plaumann's publication of P. Gradenwitz, 1, Sitzungsber. Heid. Akad., ph.-hist. Kl. 5 (1914).

[9] "Enslaved Persons Who Are Free," American Journal of Philology 59 (1938), 1–30.

P. Rainer 24, 552, on the basis of close parallelism in language. The possible objection that documents dealing with kindred legal questions would necessarily use the same essentially technical vocabulary Professor Westermann meets with three acute observations which are relevant to our purposes also. (a) Both documents use "Syria and Phoenicia"; "Syria and Phoenicia" or "Syria" alone were the official designations for the Ptolemaic possessions in the area in the third century B.C. Elsewhere in his book Pseudo-Aristeas uses "Coele Syria," a term which came into use in the second century and became the customary designation. The fact that Aristeas here uses an expression other than the one habitual with him argues for direct borrowing. (b) The original decree does not and could not have included provision for slaves brought in previously or subsequently. In regard to this Professor Westermann writes (22): "It was probably the absence of this provision in the model used by Pseudo-Aristeas in shaping his decree which suggested to the author the idea that it should be inserted at the special instance of King Ptolemy himself after the *prostagma* had been drafted and presented to him. Artistically this addition is turned into a clever literary device for enhancing that 'munificence and greatness of soul' which prompted Philadelphus to accede to the original proposal of Aristeas regarding the Jewish slaves and, in this particular, even to widen its scope." (c) In the original decree, where there is good reason for such terminology, the persons concerned are designated by the somewhat equivocal word *σώματα* rather than by the more definite expressions *δοῦλοι* or *ἀνδράποδα*. The latter expressions, but without the same legal reason, are also avoided in Aristeas, which speaks only of *τῶν Ἰουδαικῶν σωμάτων ἐν οἰκετίαις*.

If the genuine decree was in fact Aristeas' model, certain deviations from the model are palpably his own fabrication, and since these additions are echoed in III Maccabees they are relevant to our purposes here. (a) In Aristeas the king motivates his measure (in a sentence which, as Professor Westermann points out, interrupts the flow of the decree) by considerations of abstract justice and the duty of a humane ruler. The apologetic tone is out of place in the pronouncement of an absolute king, and if motivation were required its place would be in a preamble

rather than in the body of the decree.[10] But Aristeas is profoundly interested in questions of the theory and practice of kingship,[11] devoting about a third of his whole book (187–292) to a series of banquets where the subject of discussion is the proper conduct of kings and where the king's obligation to show himself just and humane is stressed. The motivation is then not only an alien element in the decree, but strictly in keeping with Aristeas' own interests and purposes.

(b) The Aristeas decree provides that slaves must be declared and their persons produced before officials appointed "within three days from the day when the decree is issued." Professor Westermann notes that this is a physical impossibility; the original decree granted twenty days for the registration of the persons involved, and another document dealing with the registration of slaves in Egypt provides two months for Alexandria and six for the countryside.[12] "The three day period in Pseudo-Aristeas," Professor Westermann writes, "was probably suggested by consideration of the reputed speed which characterized the entire procedure of the translation of the Septuagint. The discussion, formulation, and ratification of the *prostagma* occupied, from beginning to end, only seven days. The translation of the Old Testament books [in point of fact only the Pentateuch was involved] was completed in seventy-two days."

(c) Finally, the provision that informers would be given possession of the persons against whom they informed is unexampled in the entire range of Greek and Hellenistic legislation and highly improbable in the present case.[13] At Aristeas 167, indeed, Philadelphus is praised for his extremely harsh treatment of informers, as being in keeping with his enlightened regime. The

[10] In making this point Westermann, op. cit. 28, cites "the preamble to the prostagma of the king in P. Teb. III, 1, 700, 11.22–36, which contained the reasons for the enactment."

[11] See E. Bickermann, "Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 29 (1930), 280–296. W. W. Tarn, in "The Milindapanha and Pseudo-Aristeas," an appendix to his The Greeks in Bactria and India (Cambridge, 1938), 414–436, shows the relationship of this section to the numerous treatises περὶ βασιλείας written by philosophers of all schools in the Hellenistic age to provide a rationale for the institution of kingship.

[12] Op. cit., 24 f. The second document is P. Gradenwitz 1, republished by Westermann in his Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt (New York, 1929), 33 f.

[13] Westermann, op. cit. 25 f.

inconsistent touch is added in the decree apparently to demonstrate Philadelphus' intense interest in the welfare of the Jews.

III Maccabees, whose fictive date is the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator, contains two purported royal orders, in the shape of circular letters to officials rather than formal prostagmata, which similarly deal with a king's measures concerning the Jews. The first (3.11–29) is an order enjoining the arrest of all Jews for the purpose of inflicting a terrible and ignominious death upon them. After justifying his proposed measure by the stubborn wickedness of the Jews, as shown specifically by their refusal to admit him to their Temple (obviously a contrived link with the matter of the first two chapters [14]), protesting his own general philanthropy, and invoking the prudential consideration (echoing Pharaoh at Exodus 1.10), "lest when some sudden tumult is raised against us hereafter we should have these impious people behind our backs as traitors and barbarous foes," Philopator continues (25–29): [15]

We give order that, as soon as this epistle reaches you, you shall at once send to us with harsh and violent treatment those who dwell among you with women and children, binding them fast in every way with iron chains, to meet a terrible and ignominious death, as befits traitors. For we believe that when they have been punished together, our estate will be established for the future in the surest and best condition. And whoever shall habour any Jew, old man or child or very suckling, shall with all his house be tortured to death with the most horrible torments. Information may be given by anyone; *the informer* to receive the estate of the guilty party, with two thousand drachmae from the royal treasury, and to be honoured with freedom. And every place where a Jew shall be detected at all in concealment, shall be made a waste and burnt with fire, and shall become entirely useless to any mortal creature for all time.

At 7.1–9 this harsh order is rescinded by another letter of Philopator. He explains that he had been persuaded to his original cruel measure by wicked friends, and continues (6–9):

[14] The connections of the disparate sections with one another and their historical validity are examined in J. Cohen, Judaica et Aegyptiaca: De Maccabaeorum Libro III Quaestiones Historicae (Groningen, 1941).

[15] Translation of C. W. Emmet (London, 1918).

But we severely threatened them for this, and of the clemency which we have to all men scarcely granted them their lives; and knowing that the God of heaven surely protects the Jews, fighting on their side continually as a father for his children, and taking into account the goodwill as of a friend which they have shown unswervingly to us and our ancestors, we have rightly absolved them from all blame on whatsoever account. And we have ordered them each to return to his own home, and that no one in any place should injure them at all or reproach them for their unreasonable sufferings. For know well that if we devise any evil against them, or harm them in any way, we shall have not man but the ruler of all power, the Most High God, as an adversary to avenge what is done, *and that* in every way and at all time without being able to escape him. Fare ye well.

At 2.27–30, finally, we have what purports to be an edict in the form of an inscription, which also has to do with the status of the Jews:

He purposed publicly to inflict a disgrace upon the Jewish nation, and erected a pillar upon the tower in the palace with the inscription, That none who did not sacrifice should be allowed to enter their temples; and that all Jews should be degraded to the rank of natives and the condition of serfs, and that those who spoke against it should be taken by force and put to death; and that those who were registered should even be branded on their bodies with an ivy-leaf, the emblem of Dionysus, and be reduced to their former limited status. But that he might not appear an enemy to all, he added, But if any of them prefer to join those who are initiated into the mysteries, they shall have equal rights with the citizens of Alexandria.

The turgid rhetoric, exaggeration, and accentuated Jewish separatism in the first two passages correspond closely to the style and outlook of III Maccabees as a whole and stamp them as fabrications of the author. Yet that author knew something of proper Ptolemaic chancellry forms. On the basis of their formulae of salutation and farewell Bickermann, who is expert in such matters, was able to fix a date for the composition of the book,[16] and the form and content of the third passage (2.27–30) indicate that it is based on an actual document. It accords with what is known of the policy of Philopator, who used the cult of Dionysus

[16] Ca. 100 B.C., in Pauly-Wissowa 14.797–800.

as a means of unifying sections of his population and was the first to employ native Egyptians in his phalanx.[17] Moreover it fits badly with the rest of the book, for the registration envisaged is for status, not for annihilation.

The similarities between these 'documents' and the Aristeas decree are too vague to admit of anything like demonstration that the one author was directly influenced by the other; nevertheless the similarities, I believe, are too pronounced to be explained by the fact that both authors are familiar with Ptolemaic chancellry usage and both are dealing with a question of Jewish status. We can argue best not from the genuine decree which was Aristeas' model but from the alterations which, as we saw, Aristeas probably introduced into his model; and it happens that these alterations are apparently in the mind of the author of III Maccabees, no less when he is opposing than when he is adopting them. (a) In Aristeas Philadelphus is represented as justifying his measure (contrary to normal official usage) on the grounds of enlightened principles of kingship. In III Maccabees Philopator protests his general clemency, but makes his decisive motivation for releasing the Jews fear of God, who is always their ally. (b) Aristeas' decree provides that his measure be carried out with highly improbable if not impossible speed. III Maccabees, whose rhetoric intensifies everything, calls for action "as soon as this epistle reaches you" instead of Aristeas' shrift of three days. (c) The provision in Aristeas that informers be given possession of the persons of recalcitrants was, as we saw, as unlikely as it was unprecedented. III Maccabees' provision for rewarding informers *against* the Jews seem to be a clear echo of the added touch in Aristeas.

These points, tenuous in themselves, gain in plausibility when one considers the general motives of III Maccabees vis à vis Aristeas. Sterling Tracy[18] was undoubtedly right in supposing that the two works consciously advocate opposing views with regard to a proper *modus vivendi* for the Jewish community in relation to its neighbors and rulers. Aristeas seeks to show that it is possible for Jews to participate in the social and intellectual

[17] See Cohen's monograph, as cited in Note 14 above.
[18] See Note 4, above.

life of the larger community without compromising basic Jewish values; such an attitude is seen to result in the respect and admiration of the secular authorities and the 'philosophers' and in general harmony. III Maccabees, on the other hand, premises a basic hostility on the part of secular officials, insists upon full compliance with the requirements of religion, and abhors any compromise in the direction of assimilation. The denouement shows not a restored harmony but a turning of the tables, by God's intervention, which gives the Jews the upper hand. Surely the books represent rival views within the Jewish community, perhaps contemporary, more likely evoked by different conjunctures in history.

It is perhaps natural to regard Aristeas' view as the more enlightened, and when Tracy wrote it was natural to assume that the normal course of thought was from the less to the more enlightened. This may explain his assumption that Aristeas is an answer to and a correction of III Maccabees. Recent years have again impressed upon us that external pressures may shift the direction from the more enlightened to the less enlightened, and this would seem to be the case in the two works before us. In the earlier Ptolemaic period relations between Jews and the authorities had not yet been subjected to extreme strain, and a Hellenized Jew might well believe that even completer harmony could be envisaged. In III Maccabees this hope seems frustrated, and in the atmosphere of hostility and suspicion which had grown up the only recourse seemed to be a retreat to narrower observance of religious duties as a means for securing divine protection.

For the dating of the books nothing like general agreement has as yet been reached.[19] On the grounds that Egypt is represented as a sovereign state and Palestine as enjoying autonomy under its high priests, Schürer [20] and those who follow him date the work as anterior to 198 B.C. Others, and chiefly those who regard the work as interpolated,[21] would date it to the Roman period.

[19] Views in regard to dating and the arguments upon which they are based are rehearsed in the editions of Meecham and Tramontano (see Note 3) and the work of Février (see Note 21).

[20] E. Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi[4] (Leipzig, 1909), 612. Schürer is followed by, among others, Tramontano and A. Cahana, Hasepharim Hahizonim (Tel Aviv, 1937), 1–71.

[21] The 'separatist' view and the arguments for late dating are most fully set

The present tendency is to date Aristeas to about 100 B.C.[22] III Maccabees is generally dated to about the same period,[23] though V. Tcherikover has adduced cogent arguments for dating it to about 25 B.C.[24] His argument is based on the special significance attached in III Maccabees to the term *laographia*, subjection to which became a fixed mark of civic degradation when Egypt was transformed into a Roman province. Within the range of possibilities and probabilities it would seem likely, on grounds other than those suggested in this paper, that Aristeas is the older book. Perhaps that view is corroborated by the suggestion here made, and Tcherikover's position that III Maccabees was evoked by a sudden change for the worse in the status of the Egyptian Jews, specifically that brought about by the Roman conquest, may thus receive confirmation. If the later dating of III Maccabees is correct we should have to conclude that either the date of Aristeas must be brought down to a period closer to III Maccabees, or that Aristeas had become something of a 'classic' in Egyptian Jewish circles, to which a refutation might properly be addressed many years after the book was written. In any case it is not without interest to conjecture another point of contact between two Alexandrian Jewish works whose kinship on other grounds has been generally sensed.

---

forth in J. G. Février, La date, la composition, et les sources de la Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate (Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes 24: Paris, 1925).

[22] See especially Bickermann, as cited in Note 11; Tarn (as cited in the same note) agrees, as do Meecham and now P. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza (London, 1947), 132 ff.

[23] See Note 16.

[24] V. Tcherikover, The Jews in Egypt in the Hellenistic-Roman Age in the Light of the Papyri (Hebrew, with English summary; Jerusalem, 1945), 91 ff.

LATIN TRACTATES ON PREACHING: A BOOK-LIST

BY

HARRY CAPLAN AND HENRY H. KING

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

THIS LIST of treatises on preaching begins with the year 1500 and extends to the present time. It is thus a sequel to Mediaeval Artes Praedicandi: A Hand-List (Ithaca, New York 1934) and Mediaeval Artes Praedicandi: A Supplementary Hand-List (Ithaca 1936) by Harry Caplan, and to Artes Praedicandi (Paris-Ottawa 1936) by Th.-M. Charland, wherein are listed manuscripts and printed editions of tractates composed in the Middle Ages. The present list of printed books (which contains also a few manuscripts) includes as many titles as the compilers have been able to collect over a period of several years. We have, where possible, examined the books themselves, but in many instances direct observation was not feasible, and we have naturally relied on a wide variety of bibliographical sources. In making our list public we are acceding to requests made by a number of students of the doctrine and history of rhetoric and homiletics, and we hope that it may, with all its deficiencies, prove useful to investigators in these fields. We intend to follow this list of Latin treatises with like lists of treatises written in other languages of Europe.

Certain deficiencies will at once be apparent. In some instances we have not yet ascertained the dates of an author's life; in some we are uncertain of an author's religious affiliation. The List is intended to include only technical treatises, and not homiletical aids such as, for example, collections of materials for sermons, or works dealing with the moral conduct of the preacher, or tractates on Scriptural hermeneutics; yet because a personal study of the books has in so many cases been impossible, we are not overmuch concerned that a Summa praedicantium or a Thesaurus angelorum or an Officina concionatorum which may upon examination prove not to contain portions dealing with the

technique of preaching has occasionally found a place here. We have, on the other hand, intentionally recorded a number of rhetorical tractates which make use of Scripture, more than one Art of Prayer, several books of homiletical criticism (notably on St. Paul, St. Augustine, and St. John Chrysostom), and a few dealing with the history of preaching, in order to indicate that such works may also furnish material for the student of homiletical theory.

We do not pretend that the List is exhaustive; nor have we tried to discover the date and place of publication of every edition of each work. The arrangement is by centuries rather than by countries of origin, and the authors appear in alphabetical order.

This prefatory note may end with a few observations which readily present themselves: 1) Ars praedicandi, the most common title for these treatises in the Middle Ages, gives way in large part to Ars concionandi in the sixteenth century, and this title in turn to Ars homiletica at the end of the seventeenth; 2) Rhetorica sacra (or divina, ecclesiastica, Christiana) is now, in the modern period, often treated coördinately with Rhetorica civilis (or profana, humana, communis), and is indeed by some authors considered a fourth kind of rhetoric, supplementary to the traditional kinds, deliberative, judicial, and epideictic; 3) Among the Roman Catholic Orders the rise and growth of the Jesuit Order are signalized in the relatively large number of treatises by members of that Society.

Reference is made in abbreviated form to the following works:

Antonio, Nic.: Bibliotheca Hispana nova (Madrid 1783–1788).
Foppens: Bibliotheca Belgica (Brussels 1739).
Gibert: Jugemens des savans sur les auteurs, qui ont traité de la rhétorique (suite des jugemens des savans de M. Baillet. Paris 1713–1719).
Herzog: Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, ed. A. Hauck (Leipsic 1896–1907. 3d ed.).
Hurter: Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae (Innsbruck 1903–1913. 3d ed.; vol. i, 4th ed., 1926).
Jöcher: Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon (Leipsic 1750–1751).
Kayser: Vollständiges Bücher-Lexicon (Leipsic 1834–1911).
Mazzuchelli: Gli scrittori d'Italia (Brescia 1753–1763).

NICÉRON: Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres dans la république des lettres (Paris 1727–1745. By J. P. Nicéron, P. F. Oudin, J. B. Michault, and C. P. Goujet).

QUÉTIF: Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum . . . absolvit J. Échard (Paris 1719–1721).

SCHIAN: 'Die lutherische Homiletik in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts' (Gotha 1899, in Theologische Studien und Kritiken lxxii. 62–94).

THOLUCK: Das kirchliche Leben des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts (Berlin 1861).

WATT: Bibliotheca Britannica; or A general index to British and foreign literature (Edinburgh 1824).

WEIGEL: Corpus dissertationum theologicarum (Leipsic 1847).

The reader is reminded that the compilation by Giovanni Domenico Mansi (Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, Paris and Leipsic, 1901–1927) contains official pronouncements on the art of preaching which offer extensive material for special study.

P. following an author's name = Protestant, R.C. = Roman Catholic.

Sixteenth Century

ALARDUS AMSTELODAMUS (1491–1544). R.C. Ecclesiastes, sive Concionator. Cologne and Paris. Editions without date (Foppens i. 38). ALBERTSEN, HANS (1525–1569). P. Dispositio concionum. Copenhagen 1563. ANDREÄ, JAKOB (1528–1590). P. Methodus concionandi. [Frankfurt am Main? Leipsic?] 1595. Ed. Polycarp Leyser. ANONYMOUS. R.C. Considerationes utiles ad concionandum. Coimbra Univ. MS 543 (saec. xvi), ff. 113–116. ANONYMOUS. P. See Theodorus, Vitus, below. De sacris concionibus. Ulm 1535 (with the De officiis concionatoris of Melanchthon). Basel 1540 and London 1570 (with the De arte praedicandi of Reuchlin, the De officiis concionatoris of Melanchthon, and the De formandis sacris concionibus of Hepinus. See Hepinus, Melanchthon, and Reuchlin, below. ANONYMOUS. Rhetorica bonis et utilibus exemplis ex S. Scriptura et Cicerone potiss, sumptis illustrata. Leipsic 1595 (Gibert, Appendix). Cf. the tracts by Blebelius, Chytraeus, Possevino. AQUAVIVA (ACQUAVIVA), CLAUDIUS, S.J. (1543–1615). R.C. Instructio pro concionatoribus. Rome 1616 (in his Instructiones ad provinciales et superiores societatis, pp. 10–15, 93–94). ARGENTINO, FRAN-

CESCO, Card. (d. 1511). R.C. De modo praedicandi Evangelium. No date or place of publication (Jöcher). 'We do not believe that it was ever published' (Mazzuchelli).

BACMEISTER, LUCAS (1530–1608). P. De modo concionandi. Rostock 1577. BELLARMINO, (Sanctus) ROBERTO FRANCESCO ROMOLO, S.J., Card. (1542–1621). R.C. De ratione formandae concionis. Rome 1805. BLEBELIUS, THOMAS (1539–1596). P. Rhetoricae artis progymnasmata, exemplis tam sacris quam philosophicis illustrata. Leipsic 1584. Cf. Anonymous (Leipsic 1595), above. BORGIA (BORJA), (Sanctus) FRANCISCUS DE, S.J. (1510–1572). R.C. Ratio concionandi (Tractatus brevis pro praedicatoribus s. Evangelii), in Opera (tr. from the Spanish), Salamanca 1579, Antwerp, Mainz, Tours 1611, Brussels 1675; ed. P. de Ribadéneyra, tr. Andreas Schottus, Rome 1596, Antwerp 1598, Cologne 1603, Mainz 1603; with Peter Binsfeld's Enchiridion Theologiae Pastoralis, Trèves 1599, Lyons 1609, Paris 1609, 1614, 1640, 1646, Douai 1611, Rouen 1615, 1641, Cologne 1647; with the treatises of Panigarola and Joannes a Jesu Maria, ed. Jacobus de Graffiis, O.S.B., Cologne 1612; with the treatises of St. Francis de Sales and Jacobus Jansonius, ed. Martinus Steyaert, Louvain 1691 and ibid. 1703 (Elucubrationes Steyartinae, vol. iii); with St. Francis Xavier's De praedicatione Evangelica paraeneses, Venice 1802. In Spanish original: Obras, ed. J. E. Nieremberg, Biblioteca Económica, vol. xvii, Barcelona 1882. In French: Petit traicté de la manière de bien prescher, in Pedro de Ribadéneyra, La vie du Rév. Père François de Borgia, Douai 1603, 3d ed. Lyons 1609; in Peter Binsfeld, La théologie des pasteurs et autres prestres ayant charge des âmes, ed. Philippes Bermyer, Paris 1626, Rouen 1640, Toulouse 1648, Lyons 1649, 1657. In German: In Franz Krus, S.J., Fragen der Predigt-Ausarbeitung, Innsbruck 1916. In Italian: Trattato per i predicatori del sacrosanto vangelo di S. Francesco, Palermo 1757. BORROMEO, (Saint) CARLO (1538–1584). R.C. Pastorum concionatorumque instructiones. Milan 1583 and 1599, ibid. 1747 (in Opera, 5 vols., best ed.); Paris 1585 (ed. Joannes Botero) and 1643; Antwerp 1586; Cologne 1587; Rome 1594 (in Gabriele Paleotti, Archiepiscopale Bononiense, ed. H. Brunus); Bologna 1616 (in Ridolfo Paleotti, Episcopale della città e diocese d'Imola, ed. A. Paganino); (cum annotationibus Francisci Sylvii) Douai 1616 and 1624, Augsburg 1758 and 1762, and Ghent 1828; Lyons 1683; Innsbruck 1846 (Bibliotheca pastoralis, vol. ii); Münster in Westph. 1846, 1860. See also: Federico Barbieri, La riforma dell' eloquenza sacra in Lombardia operata da s.

Carlo Borromeo, Milan 1911; and Domenico Fanucchi, La moderna predicazione confrontata colle instruzioni di s. Carlo Borromeo: prolusione, Milan 1891. BULLINGER, HEINRICH (1504–1575). P. De prophetae officio, et quomodo digne administrari oratio. Zürich 1538.

CARBONE DA COSTACCIARO, LODOVICO (d. 1597). R.C. Divinus orator, vel de rhetorica divina libri septem. Venice 1595. CASSANDER, GEORGIUS (1513?–1566). R.C. De arte concionandi liber. No place or date of publication (Foppens i. 335). CAVANILLES, JOANNES. R.C. See in Seventeenth Century list. CHYTRÄUS (KOCHHAFE), DAVID (1531–1600). P. Praecepta rhetoricae inventionis, illustrata multis et utilibus exemplis ex sacra scriptura et Cicerone sumptis. Leipsic and Wittenberg · 1562. Cf. Anonymous (Leipsic 1595) above. CIRUELUS, PETRUS (c. 1470–c. 1550). R.C. De arte praedicandi. Alcalà de Henares 1528. CLAUSER, KONRAD (d. 1611). Artificiosa methodus declamandi, concionandi, disputandi, conscribendi epistulas (Certa declamandi et concionandi methodus ex probatissimis . . . Graecis et Latinis autoribus . . . desumpta, etc.). Basel 1555. COLPINUS, PETRUS (d. 1599). R.C. De modo concionandi. No place or date of publication (Jöcher). CONCILIUM MEDIOLANENSE I. anno Christi 1565. Constitutionum Pars Prima. vi: 'De praedicatione verbi Dei.' R.C. Paris and Leipsic 1902. In Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, ed. Johannes Dominicus Mansi, xxxiv. 8–10.

DANEAU, LAMBERT (c. 1530–1595). P. Methodus sacrae scripturae in publicis tum praelectionibus tum concionibus utiliter atque intelligenter tractandae, quae praxi, id est aliquot exemplis et perpetuo in Epistolam Pauli ad Philemonem commentario illustratur. Geneva 1570, 1579, 1581. DÍAZ (DÍAS), FELIPE, O.M. (d. 1601). R.C. Summa praedicantium. Venice 1586 (2 vols.); Salamanca 1589 (2 vols.); Lyons 1592. Contains technical material? DIDACUS À VICTORIA, O.P. (d. 1540). R.C. Tractatus de arte et modo concionandi. MS. Place and date unknown (Quétif ii. 107b). DUNGERSHEIM, HIERONYMUS (1465–1540). R.C. De modo discendi et docendi ad populum sacra, seu de modo praedicandi. No place of publication, 1513 (Hurter ii. 1246); Landshut 1514.

ERASMUS, DESIDERIUS (1466?–1536). R.C. Ecclesiastes, sive de ratione concionandi libri iv. Basel 1535, 1536, 1540 (in Opera), 1544; Antwerp 1535, 1539; Leiden 1543, ibid. 1703–1706 (Opera, vol. v); London 1730 (Liber primus); Leipsic 1820. In English: anon. tr., London 1797. In German: tr. J. V. Henneberg, Gotha 1822.

ESTELLA (STELLA), DIDACUS DE, O.M. (1524–1578). R.C. De ratione concionandi, sive rhetorica ecclesiastica. Salamanca 1576, 1596; Venice 1584, 1598; Cologne 1586, 1587, 1596; ibid. 1594 and 1611 (with the Ecclesiastica rhetorica of Luís de Granada); Lyons, 1592; Paris 1635 (with the treatise of Luís de Granada); Rome 1693 (Introductio ad lecturae theologicae et praedicationis evangelium (sic) officium pro religionis Seraphicae studentibus).

GARCÍA MATAMORUS, ALPHONSUS (1490–1550). R.C. De tribus dicendi generibus, etc., cui accessit de methodo concionandi liber unus (juxta rhetoricae artis praescriptum). Alcalà de Henares 1570. GRANADA, LUÍS DE, O.P. (1504–1588). R.C. Ecclesiasticae rhetoricae sive de ratione concionandi libri sex. Lisbon 1576, 1762; Venice (with the treatise by Augustinus Valerius) 1578; Cologne 1578 and 1582, ibid. 1594 and 1611 (with the treatise by Diego Stella); Paris 1583, ibid. 1635 (with the treatise by Stella); Milan 1585. In Spanish: De la retórica eclesiástica, o de la manera de predicar, Valencia 1768; Barcelona 1770, 1778 (tr. José Climent); Madrid 1793, 1800 (in Obras), 1852, 1863 (Obras, vol. iii). In French: La rhétorique de l'église ou l'éloquence des prédicateurs, Paris 1698 (2 editions), Lyons 1829.

HEMMINGIUS, NICOLAUS (HEMMINGSEN, NIELS, 1513–1600). P. 1. De methodis libri duo, quorum . . . posterior ecclesiasten, sive methodum theologicam interpretandi concionandique continet. Rostock 1555; Wittenberg 1559, 1562, 1569; Leipsic 1565, 1570, 1578; Basel 1572. 2. Pastor, sive pastoris optimus vivendi agendique modus. Copenhagen 1562, 1590; Wittenberg 1562; Leipsic 1574, 1585; Geneva 1579; Erfurt 1585; Rostock 1585, 1590. In German: Leipsic 1562, 1566; Wittenberg 1564; Hamburg 1639. In English: London 1574, 1576 (The preacher, or methode of preaching. Wrytten in Latine by Nicholas Hemminge, and translated into Englishe, by I.H. [i.e. John Horsfall]). See also: J. H. Paulli: Niels-Hemmingsens Pastoraltheologie. Diss. Copenhagen 1851. HEPINUS (ÆPINUS), JOHANNES (1499–1553). P. Formula compendiaria de formandis sacris concionibus. Basel 1540, London 1570. See Melanchthon and Reuchlin, below. HERBORN (FERBER), NICOLAUS, O.M. (1480?–1535). R.C. Methodus praedicandi verbi divini concionatoribus cum utilis tum accommodata. Cologne 1529. Cf. Karl Köhler, 'Nicolaus Ferber's Methodus praedicandi verbi divini von 1529,' in Zeitschrift für praktische Theologie xv (Frankfurt am Main 1893). 305 ff. HEVIA (NEVIA), FRANCISCUS DE, O.M. (fl. 1547). R.C. Thesaurus

angelorum, in quo plura habentur praedicatoribus et confessoribus utilia. Astorga 1547. Contains technical matter? HOROZCO, ALPHONSUS DE, O.S.A. (1500–1591). R.C. De arte concionandi. No place or date of publication; not known whether in Latin or in Spanish (Nic. Anton. i. 29). HUNNIUS, AEGIDIUS (1550–1603). P. Methodus concionandi. Wittenberg 1595, 1596. HUTTER, LEONHARD (1563–1616). P. Formulae concionandi. Wittenberg 1635. HYPERIUS, ANDREAS GERARDI (1511–1564). P. De formandis concionibus sacris, seu de interpretatione Scripturarum populari. Marburg 1553, Dortmund 1555, Basel 1573, 1579; Halle 1581 (ed. H. B. Wagnitz). Cf. the title of the tract by Villavicente, below. In English: The practice of preaching, otherwise called the pathway to the pulpit (tr. John Ludham), London 1577. In French: Enseignement à bien former les saintes prédications et sermons, etc., Geneva 1563. In German: Die Homiletik und die Katechetik des Andreas Hyperius, tr. by E. C. Achelis and Eugen Sachsse, Berlin 1901. See also: Achelis, E. C., 'Hyperius, Andreas,' Leipsic 1900 (in: Realencyklopaedie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. viii); Biestervelt, P., Andreas Hyperius, voornamelijk als homileet, Kampen 1895; Dühmert, 'Die Verdienste des Hyperius um den wissenschaftlichen Ausbau der Homiletik,' Stuttgart 1898 (in: Mancherlei Gaben und Ein Geist, xxxix. Jahrg.); Mangold, Wilhelm, 'Hyperius, Andreas,' Gotha 1856 (in: Realencyklopaedie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 1st ed., vol. vi); Müller, K. F., Andreas Hyperius: ein Beitrag zu seiner Charakteristik, Kiel 1895; Schian, Martin, 'Die Homiletik des Andreas Hyperius,' in Zeitschrift für praktische Theologie xviii/xix (1896/7); Vaucher, Édouard, 'André Gérard d'Ypres et la théologie pratique,' Paris 1901 (in: Études de théologie et d'histoire publiées par MM. les professeurs de théologie protestante de Paris en hommage à la Faculté de théologie de Montaubon à l'occasion du tricentenaire de sa fondation).

JANSONIUS, JACOBUS (1547–1625). R.C. Ecclesiastes, sive de ratione concionandi instructio triplex: S. Francisci Borgiae, S. Francisci Salesii, et Jacobi Jansonii S.T.D. Lov., cum annotatione pro tyronibus in collegiis. Louvain 1691, 1703 (in Martinus Steyaert, Elucubrationes Steyartinae, vol. iii), 1717 and 1742 (in Opuscula Ex. D. Martini Steyaert).

KECKERMANNUS, BARTHOLOMAEUS (1571/3–1608/9). P. Rhetorica ecclesiastica, sive artis formandi et habendi conciones sacras libri duo: methodice adornati per praecepta et explicationes. Hanau 1600 (1st ed.), 1606 (3d ed.), 1613; Geneva 1614 (in Opera omnia).

LANQUIER, ANTONIUS, O. Carm. R.C. Synopsis ad faciendam piam concionem orthodoxis. Paris 1578. LEGATE (LEGATT), JOHN, O.S.B. (fl. 1500). R.C. Prophetica, sive de sacra et unica ratione concionandi tractatus. Cambridge 1592 (2d ed.). LEMOS, LUÍS DE (latter half saec. xvi). R.C. De optima praedicandi ratione libri sex. Salamanca 1585. LUBOMLIUS, SEVERINUS, O.P. (fl. 1600). R.C. Theatrum seu potius officina concionatorum praedicatoribus et theologis . . . permaxime utilis et necessaria. Venice 1597. Contains technical matter?

MATTHIAE (MADSEN), JACOBUS (1538–1586). P. Doctrina de concionandi ratione et caussis eloquentiae . . . publice praelecta in academia Hafniensi, ed. Anders Krag: Tom. iii: Ecclesiastes sive concionator. Basel 1589, 1590. MELANCHTHON, PHILIPP (1497–1560). P. 1. De officiis concionatoris dissertatio. Ulm 1525 (Ratio brevis . . . sacrarum tractandorum [sic] concionum, vulgo modus praedicand [sic] adpellata, a quodam docto & pio conciniatore [sic. See Vitus Theodorus], Philippi Melanchtonis familiari congesta. Cui iuncta est Philippi Melanchto. de officio [sic] concionatoris, & quibusdam aliis luculenta dissertatio). Preceded by two undated imprints also issued at Ulm. Also Magdeburg 1538; Basel 1540 and London 1570 (with the treatises by Reuchlin, Anon. [Vitus Theodorus], and Hepinus); Frankfurt am Main 1597 (with the Themata concionum etc., of Andreas Pancratius); Basel 1541 (in Opera iii. 282–286); Wittenberg 1562 (in Operum pars secunda, pp. 30–34); Leipsic 1929 (in Supplementa Melanchthoniana, V. Abt.: Schriften zur praktischen Theologie, ed. by Paul Drews and Ferdinand Cohrs, Teil II: Homiletische Schriften, pp. 5–14). 2. Quomodo concionator novitius concionem suam informare debeat (written between 1531 and 1536). Leipsic 1929 (in Drews and Cohrs, op. cit., 17–29). 3. De modo et arte concionandi (written c. 1537–1539). Strassburg 1540 (in Kaspar Cruciger's 'Commentarius' zum 1. Timotheusbrief); Wittenberg 1570 (preceding vol. iii of Georg Major, Opera); ibid. 1571 and 1594 (Abstract preceding Andreas Pancratius, Methodus concionandi); Leipsic 1929 (in Drews and Cohrs, op. cit., pp. 33–55). 4. De ratione concionandi (De arte concionandi, written toward the end of 1552). Leipsic 1929 (in Drews and Cohrs, op. cit., pp. 59–79).

NATTA, MARCANTONIO, S.J. (fl. 1562). R.C. De eloquentia Christianorum. Frankfurt 1562.

OSIANDER, LUCAS (1534–1604). P. De ratione concionandi. Tübingen 1582; Wittenberg 1584.

PALLADIUS, NIELS (c. 1510–1560). P. Concionator, seu regulae quaedam utiles ac necessariae concionatoribus observandae. Copenhagen 1556, 1570, 1627 (ed. H. P. Resen). PANCRATIUS (PANGRATIUS), ANDREAS (1531–1576). P. Methodus concionandi, etc. Wittenberg 1571, 1574, 1594 (See Melanchthon, 3, above). PANIGAROLA, FRANCESCO, O.M. (1548–1594). R.C. Rhetorica ecclesiastica, sive de modo componendae concionis libellus (tr. from the Italian). Cologne 1605, ibid. 1612 (ed. Jacobus de Graffiis, with the treatises by Franciscus de Borgia and Joannes a Jesu Maria); Mainz 1612 (tr. Michaëlis Cremelius, O.P.). In Italian original: Modo di comporre una predica, Milan, Cremona, Rome 1584; Venice 1603, ibid. 1643 (in Giuseppe degli Aromatari, Degli autori del ben parlare, Pt. v). In French: L'art de prescher et bien faire un sermon, tr. Gabriel Chappuis, Paris 1604, 1608, 1624; Lyons 1615. PÉREZ, JACOBI, O.S.A. (d. 1490 or 1491). R.C. De sacra ratione concionandi. Barcelona 1588. PERKINS, WILLIAM (1558–1602). P. Prophetica, sive de unica ratione concionandi. Cambridge 1592, Basel 1602, Geneva 1611–1618, 1624 (in his Opera theologica). In English: The arte of prophesying, or a treatise concerning the sacred and onely true manner and methode of preaching, tr. Thomas Tuke, London (in Perkins' Collected works), 1606, 1612, 1613 (3 vols.), 1616–1618 (3 vols.), 1631; Cambridge 1608–1609 (in Works, 3 vols.). In Dutch: Amsterdam 1659 (in Werken, 3 vols.). POLUS (POLE, POOL), REGINALDUS, Card. (1500–1558). R.C. De modo concionandi = Literae pontificiae Pauli III. a. 1542 (Hurter ii.1468). PONS, JOSEPHUS BONAVENTURA, O.P. (saec. xvi). R.C. Modus concionandi. Place of publication unknown (about 1577, Quétif ii.336). Tongue uncertain (Nic. Anton. i.803). POSSEVINO, ANTONIO, S.J. (1534–1612). R.C. Cicero collatus cum ethnicis et sacris scriptoribus, quo agitur de ratione conscribendi epistolas et de arte dicendi etiam ecclesiastica. Lyons 1593. Cf. Anonymous (Leipsic 1595), above. PRICE, GULIELMUS. P. Ars concionandi. Frankfurt 1583, Amsterdam 1657.

REUCHLIN, JOHANN (1455–1522/3). R.C. Liber congestorum de arte praedicandi. Pforzheim 1504, 1508; Basel 1540 and London 1570 (with Anon. [see Theodorus, Vitus], De sacris concionibus, and treatises by Melanchthon [No. 1] and Hepinus). RHEGIUS, URBANUS (1489–1541). P. Formulae quaedam caute et citra scandalum loquendi. Wittenberg 1535 (1st ed.); Magdeburg 1538; Leipsic 1544, 1908. A technical treatise on preaching? RICCOBONI, ANTONIO (1541–1597 or 1599). R.C. Praxis rhetorica, sive de usu

artis rhetoricae in tribus generibus causarum et in orationibus ecclesiasticis libri xvi. Cologne 1588. RODULPHUS, PETRUS (PIETRO RIDOLFI DA TOSSIGNANO), O.M. (d. 1601). R.C. Libri tres de Christiano oratore, ubi diversa themata ad mores instruendos, citatis hinc inde locis ex sacris Biblijs et insignioribus patribus tractantur. Venice 1595. Includes technical material?

SALES, (Saint) FRANCIS DE (1567–1622). R.C. Modus concionandi and Extemporalis concionator semper paratus. Toulouse 1637 (in Opera omnia): Cologne 1685 (ed. Joannes Drachter); cf. (under Franciscus de Borgia) the treatise in Martin Steyaert, Ecclesiastes, sive de ratione concionandi instructio triplex, Louvain 1691, and ibid. 1703 (Elucubrationes Steyartinae, vol. iii); De vero praedicandi modo (De vera praedicandi ratione, Letter to Andreas Frémiot), Palermo 1692, Warsaw 1777 (ed. Onuphrius Szembek), Padua 1880. In English: London 1871 (in A selection from the spiritual letters of S. Francis de Sales, ed. and tr. Henrietta L. Farrer Lear, pp. 22–43). In French: Paris 1767 (in Opuscules, ed. J.M.P.D.C., vol. iii), 1803 (in Maximes des pères sur la prédication evangélique), 1835 (in Oeuvres complètes éd. de Blaise), 1867 (ed. L.-F. Guérin) and 1890 (ed. Pagès, in Oeuvres choisies, vol. iv); Annecy 1892–1928 (in Oeuvres complètes, 23 vols. critical ed. by Mackey and Navatel). In German: Augsburg 1834 (Brief an den Erzbischof von Bourges, Andreas Frémiot, über die Weise zu predigen, ed. and tr. P. Sigismund). In Italian: Rome 1726 (Il predicatore instruito, etc., in Benedictus XIII, Opuscula varia, No. 13), Milan 1898 (Metodo per ben predicare). See also Bazan, Ferdinando, below. SANTIAGO, JOANNES DE, S.J. (1532–1604). R.C. Methodus concionandi. Seville 1595. SEMPERE, ANDRÉS (d. c. 1571). R.C. Methodus oratoria, item et de sacra ratione concionandi libellus. Valencia 1568. STAPLETON, THOMAS (1535–1598). R.C. Promptuarium catholicum ad instructionem concionatorum contra haereticos nostri temporis. Cologne 1592; Aschaffenburg 1622–1624. See especially Praefatio ad lectorem. SURGANT, JOANNES ULRICUS (c. 1450–1503). R.C. Manuale curatorum praedicandi. Basel 1503, 1508; Strassburg 1520.

THEODORUS, VITUS (DIETRICH, VEIT, 1507–1549). P. Ratio brevis et docta, piaque, sacrarum tractandorum (sic) concionum, vulgo Modus praedicand (sic) adpellata, a quodam docto & pio conciniatore (sic), Melanchtonis familiari congesta, Ulm 1535 and two earlier undated imprints (with Melanchthon's De officiis concionatoris); Basel 1540 and London 1570 (De arte concionandi formulae ut breves,

ita doctae & piae, Ioanne Reuchlino Phorcense, Anonymo quodam Rhapsodo [identified by Paul Drews and Ferdinand Cohrs as Vitus Theodorus], Philippo Melanchthone, D. Ioanne Hepino, auctoribus). TRÈVES, COUNCIL OF (1549). R.C. Concilium Treverense II, iv: 'Vocatus et admissus quid pro concione docere debeat.' Paris 1902 (Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio cujus J. D. Mansi et [alii] editores, vol. xxxii. 1442–1443). TRUXILLO, TOMÁS DE (fl. 1600). R.C. 1. De ratione accurate concionandi. Barcelona 1592. 2. Thesaurus concionatorum. Barcelona 1579; Lyons 1582, 1584; Venice 1583, 1592; Paris 1585. Technical?

USINGHEM, BARTHOLOMAEUS ARNOLDI AB, O.S.A. (c. 1462–1532). R.C. De praedicatione Evangelii. Würzburg 1526. Technical?

VALADES (VELADES), DIEGO, O.M. (fl. 1570). R.C. Rhetorica christiana ad concionandi et orandi usum accommodata. Perugia 1574, 1579, 1583; Rome 1587. VALDIVIA, DIEGO PÉREZ DE (1510–1589). R.C. De sacra ratione concionandi. Barcelona 1588, Antwerp 1598. VALERIO (VALIERO), AGOSTINO (1531–1606). R.C. De rhetorica ecclesiastica sive modo concionandi libri tres. Venice 1574, ibid. 1578 (with the treatise by Luís de Granada); Paris 1575; Cologne 1575. According to Nicéron (v. 252) and Watt (ii. 926e) eight eds. of this work were published during the author's life. In French: Paris 1750, Rhétorique du prédicateur d'Agostino Valiero, tr. J. A. T. Dinouart; Petit-Montrouge 1831 (in Appendix to Dictionnaire d'éloquence sacrée, ed. Joseph-Cyprien Nadal). VILLAVICENTE, LORENZO DE, O.S.A. (d. 1580). R.C. De formandis sacris concionibus seu de interpretatione Scripturarum populari libri iv. Antwerp 1565; Cologne 1575. Cf. the title of the tract by Hyperius, above.

WELLER, HIERONYMUS (1499–1572). P. De modo et ratione concionandi. Nürnberg 1562, Giessen 1701 (ed. J. H. Maius), Leipsic 1702 (in Opera).

XAVIER, (Saint) FRANCISCUS, S.J. (1506–1552). R.C. De praedicatione Evangelica paraeneses ad vivos apostolicos coelestis sapientiae artibus atque copiis instruendas. Venice 1802. See Borgia, Franciscus De, above.

ZEPPER, WILHELM (1550–1607). P. Ars habendi et audiendi conciones sacras. Siegen (Herborn) 1598, 1616. ZORILLA, ALPHONSUS DE (1508–1570). R.C. De sacris concionibus recte formandis. Rome 1543.

Seventeenth Century

ALBERTIS, ALBERTUS DE, S.J. (1593–1676). R.C. Actio in eloquentiae cum prophanae tum sacrae corruptores (Thesaurus eloquentiae sacrae et prophanae, etc.). Milan 1651; Cologne 1669. ALSTED, JOHANN HEINRICH (1588–1638). P. Rhetorica ecclesiastica (in his Theologia prophetica). Offenbach 1611; Herborn 1612, 1616; Hanau 1622, 1634. AMADEUS BAJOCENSIS, O. Cap. (d. 1676). R.C. Paulus ecclesiastes, seu eloquentia christiana, qua orator evangelicus ad ideam et doctrinam divi Pauli formatur. Paris 1662, Venice 1720, Augsburg 1745. ANANDER (ANON.), DANIEL. P. Nova concionandi methodus non nova. Wittenberg 1683. ANONYMOUS. P. Officium concionatoris: in quo praecepta utilissima de invenienda habendaque concione . . . ex optimis auctoribus collecta et methodice disposita. Cambridge 1655. ARNOLDUS OLORINUS, or CYGNAEUS (d. 1622). R.C. De arte concionandi. 's Hertogenbusch 1611. ARRIAGA, PABLO JOSÉ DE, S.J. (1564–1622). R.C. Rhetoris christiani partes septem. Lyons 1619. ASSIGNY, MARIUS D' (1643–1717). P. Rhetorica Anglorum, vel exercitationes oratoriae in rhetoricam sacram et communem, quibus adjiciuntur quaedam regulae ad imbecilles memorias corroborandas. London 1699. AVENARIUS (HABERMANN), JOANNES (1653–1713). P. Praecepta homiletica ex hodegetico ac discursibus magnorum Carpzoviorum. Leipsic 1686. See Carpzov, below.

BAIL, LUDOVICUS (d. 1669 or 1670). R.C. Sapientia foris praedicans. Paris 1666. 'Historia illustrium concionatorum' (Morhof, Polyhistor, 4th ed., 1747, i. 989). BAZAN, FERDINANDO (1627–1702). R.C. Littera pastoralis . . . amplectens instructiones sacrorum oratorum verbum Dei evangelizantium. Litterae sacrae Congregationis Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae cardinalium . . . Concilii Tridentini interpretum, super verbi Dei praedicatione. Divi Francisci Salesii epistola ex italo in latinum versa. Palermo 1692. See also Sales, Francis de, above. BEURRIER, PAUL (1610–1696). R.C. Compendium rhetoricae christianae. Paris 1672. BINCH, IOHANN (1586–1671). P. Mellificium theologicum ad disputandum et concionandum proficuum. Amsterdam 1666. Technical? BORROMEO, FEDERICO (1564–1631). R.C. De sacris nostrorum temporum oratoribus libri quinque. Milan 1632. BOTSACK, JOHANN (1600–1674). P. Introductio in artem homileticam. No place or date of publication (Jöcher). BREITHAUPT, JOACHIM JUSTUS (1658–1732). P. Institutio hermeneutico-homiletica ex Augustini libris iv de doctrina Christiana

conquisita, illustrata, atque ad usum accommodata. Kiel 1685. BUSCH, HANS (d. 1711). P. Rhetorica sacra, sive de usu rhetorices in rebus theologicis. Copenhagen 1687–1688 (2 vols.).

CARPZOV, JOHANN BENEDICT (I., 1607–1657). P. Hodegeticum concionatorium. Leipsic 1636, 1652, 1656, 1689, 1695, 1701. CAVANILLES (CAVANILIUS), JOANNES. R.C. De sacro oratore. [Valencia?], no date. Uncertain whether saec. xvi or xvii (Nic. Anton. i.676). CAUSSIN, NICOLAS, S.J. (1583–1651). R.C. Eloquentiae sacrae et humanae parallela, libri xvi. LaFlêche 1619; Paris 1623, 1627, 1630; Lyons 1643. CHAPPELL, WILLIAM (1582–1649). P. Methodus concionandi. London 1648. In English: The preacher, or the art and method of preaching, London 1656. CHEMNITZ, CHRISTIAN (1615–1666). P. Methodus concionandi, sive rhetorica ecclesiastica. Jena 1658. COTTA, C. F. P. Orator. eccles. form. et in tabul. redacta (sic Weigel 2063). Meiningen 1689. COVARRUBIAS, FRANCISCUS ALPHONSUS DE. R.C. Brevis tractatus pro institutione evangelici praedicatoris. Madrid 1650. CRAMER (CANDIDUS), DANIEL (1568–1637). P. Methodus concionandi. No place or date of publication (Jöcher). CREBS, ANDREAS (BORUSSUS). R.C. Praxis rhetorica, et delineatio partis secundae praxeos rhetoricae ecclesiasticae de formandis concionibus. Danzig 1611.

DIEST, HEINRICH VON (1595–1673). P. Instructio de arte concionatoria. Arnhem 1665. DIEU, LEWIS DE (1590–1642). P. Aphorismi theologici et rhetorica sacra (ed. M. Leydecker). Utrecht 1693. DRAUT (DRAUDIUS), GEORG (1573–1635). P. Bibliotheca classica; includes section, 'Concionatorum instructio.' Frankfurt am Main 1611, 1625. DREXELIUS, JEREMIAS, S.J. (1581–1638). R.C. Rhetorica coelestis seu attente precandi scientia. Antwerp 1636, 1641, Munich 1637. DULMAN, THEODORUS, S.J. (1598–1668). R.C. De oratore christiano, sive varia ad fructuose concionandum methodum spectantia documenta. Cologne 1646.

ESCARDO, JUAN BAUTISTA (d. 1652). R.C. Rhetorica christiana. Mallorca 1647.

FERRARI, FRANCESCO BERNARDINO (1585–1665). R.C. De ritu sacrarum ecclesiae veteris concionum libri tres. Milan 1620, Paris 1664, Utrecht 1692 (with preface by J. G. Graevius).

GAUSSENUS, STEPHANUS (d. 1675). P. De ratione concionandi. Saumur 1670, Utrecht 1678, Halle 1727 (with preface by J. J. Rambach), Leyden 1792. GLASSIUS, SALOMO (1593–1656). P. Phi-

lologia sacra: Book v = Rhetorica sacra. Jena 1623, 1645; Frankfurt am Main and Hamburg 1653; Frankfurt am Main and Leipsic 1686, 1691; Amsterdam 1694, 1711; Leipsic 1713, 1743, 1776–1797. GODY, SIMPLICIANUS, O.S.B. (c. 1600–1662). R.C. Ad eloquentiam Christianam via. Paris 1648. GOEBEL, SEBASTIAN (1628–1685). R.C. Methodologia homiletica. No place, 1672 (Herzog viii.295; Schian 1899, p. 70; Jöcher). GOETZE, GEORG HEINRICH (1667 or 1668–1728 or 1729). P. 1. De concionibus sacerdotum, calamo exceptis. Leipsic (Lübeck) 1716. 2. De concionatoribus gratiae. Leipsic 1719. 3. De concionatoribus castrensibus. Ibid. 1700. 4. De concionibus sacris in ordine circulari. Annaberg 1694. Uncertain whether these four works are technical. 5. Rhetorica ecclesiastica. Leipsic 1700. GROSS, JOHANN GEORG (1581–1630). P. De methodo concionandi Basel 1629.

HÄBERLIN, GEORGIUS HENRICUS (1644–1699). P. 'Breviductio ad oratoriam ecclesiasticam.' Tübingen 1690. In his Specimen theologiae practicae, pp. 260–343. HARTMANN, IOHANN LUDWIG (1640–1684). P. Pastorale evangelicum (Bk. 3, chaps. 5–15 treat of the 'officium homileticum'). Nürnberg 1697, 1722. HARTNACCIUS, DANIEL (1642–1708). P. Oratoria sacra, seu commentatio de eloquentia ecclesiastica et civili. Schleswig 1700. HEFFNER, FRANCISCUS, O. Praemonstr. (fl. 1691). R.C. Concionator extemporalis. Nürnberg 1691, 1710, 1720; Sulzbach 1691 1693. HOORNBEEK, JOHANNES (1617–1666). P. Tractatus de ratione concionandi. Utrecht 1685 (in Andreas van Essen, Compendium theologiae dogmaticum, 2d ed., at end). HÜLSEMANN, JOHANN (1602–1661). P. Methodus concionandi. Wittenberg 1667, 1671, 1689.

JESUS-MARÍA, JUAN DE, O. Carm. (1564–1614 or 1615). R.C. 1. Ars concionandi compendio scripta. Cologne and Rome 1610 (with his Rhetorica ecclesiastica), Paris 1612. 2. Rhetorica ecclesiastica Cologne and Rome 1610 (with his Ars concionandi), Cologne 161 (with the tracts of Francesco de Borgia and Francesco Panigarola, ed Jacobus de Graffiis, O.S.B.); ibid. 1618. JIMÉNEZ (XIMÉNEZ) PATÓN, BARTOLOMÉ (fl. early saec. xvii). R.C. Mercurius trimegistus, sive de triplici eloquentia, sacra, española (sic), romana Madrid 1621, Baeza 1621. JUSTINIANI (GIUSTINIANI), FABIEN (1578–1627). R.C. De sacro concionatore. Cologne 1619.

KIRCHMAIER, GEORG KASPAR (1635–1700). P. 1. De oratore civili et ecclesiastico. Wittenberg 1686. 2. De oratorum ecclesiasticorum methodo homiletica. Wittenberg 1690.

LOBKOWITZ, JOANNES CARAMUEL (1606–1682). R.C. Encyclopaedia concionatoria. Prague 1649, Sant' Angelo near Naples 1664. Probably only a collection of materials for preachers. LOHNER, TOBIAS, S.J. (1619–1696 or 1697). R.C. Bibliotheca manualis concionatoria. Dillingen 1681 (4 vols., 1st ed.), 1689, 1691, 1695 (3d ed.); Venice 1700 (4 vols., 4th ed.); Augsburg 1732, 1771 (3 vols.); Paris 1874 (4 vols.), 1880 (5 vols.). Includes technical material? In French: Manuel du prédicateur, Paris 1857 (3 vols.). LYSER, WILHELM (1592–1640). P. Cursus homileticus. Wittenberg 1701.

MARTINUS, JOHANNES (d. 1665). P. Praxeos populariter concionandi rudimenta. Groningen 1651. MÜLLER, HEINRICH (1631–1675). P. Orator ecclesiasticus, sistens, praeter methodum concionandi, complures alias materias theologicas . . . Rostock 1659, 1670.

OLIVA E SOUSA, FELICIANO DE (1579–1656). R.C. Tractatus de foro ecclesiae, in tres partes divisus. Geneva 1678, 1733, 1761.

PONTANUS, GEORGIUS BARTHOLDUS (d. 1616). R.C. Aureum diurnale concionatorum. Cologne 1611, ibid. 1629 and 1640 (with Brevis praxis ad rite concionandum ex F. Romano et A. Sucquet). Probably not technical.

QUENSTEDT, JOANNES ANDREAS (1617–1688). P. Ethica Pastorum, & Instructio Cathedralis, sive Monita omnibus ac singulis munus concionatorium ambientibus & obeuntibus, cum quoad vitam, tum quoad concionem formandam, scitu & observatu necessaria . . . Wittenberg 1678, ibid. 1708 (3d ed.).

REBHAN, NICOLAUS (1571–1626). P. Concionator quomodo comparatus esse debeat ut ecclesiam Christi aedificet. [Eisenach?] 1625 (Tholuck, p. 132, Jöcher). REGIUS, CAROLUS, S.J. (d. 1612). R.C. Orator christianus. Rome 1612, Mainz 1613. REYS, GASPAR DOS, O. Carm. (d. 1668). R.C. Lucerna concionatorum. Lisbon 1658 (Part i). Part ii in MS in the Carmelite Monastery at Lisbon (Nic. Anton. ii. 571). Includes technical material? RIVINUS, TILEMANN ANDREAS (1654–1692). P. 1. Hodegetici ad artem concionatoriam Carpzoviani uberior explanatio. Leipsic 1686. 2. Lux ecclesiae et mel homileticum, etc. Leipsic 1698. Technical? See also Heine, Samuel Gottlieb: Praxis homiletica theoriae Rivinianae (Leipsic 1714). ROMANUS, FRANCISCUS, S.J. (d. 1625). R.C. De sacro ecclesiaste, sive de arte dicendi in sacris concionibus libri 3. Cologne 1622. See also Pontanus, Georgius Bartholdus, above.

SANCTO DOMINICO, JACOBUS A. O.P. (1617–1704). R.C. Compendium totius artis bene dicendi. Lingen (bei Ems) 1668. Includes a treatment of preaching? SANDEN, BERNHARD VON (1636–1703). P. Theologia homiletica. [Königsberg?] 1681. Includes technical material? SCHARFF, JOHANN (1595–1660). P. De virtutibus homileticis. Wittenberg 1669. SCHUESLER, O. W. P. Monita homiletica, etc. Halle 1697. SCRIVERIUS, CHRISTIAN (1629–1693). P. Methodus concionandi ex colloquiis Scriveri scripta (ed. J. J. Wolf). Magdeburg 1699. SEIGLIER, VINCENTIUS, O.P. (d. 1652). R.C. Forma eloquentiae christianae, seu de optimo genere concionandi, per modum dialogi: Interlocutores Theologus, Ethologus, Epidicus, Eugenius, et Calliphanus. MS. Paris, Conventus SS. Annunciationis (Quétif ii. 571). SIERRA (SERRA or SARRA), Fr. BERNARDUS, O. S. Trin. Pat. Red. R.C. Speculum praedicatorum verbi Dei, sive tractatus de variis modis exponendi sacram scripturam. Tortosa 1634. Includes technical matter? STRADA, FAMIANUS (1572–1649). R.C. Eloquentia bipartita. Amsterdam 1658, Oxford 1662. Includes material on the technique of preaching? SUCQUET, ANTONIUS (1574–1626). R.C. See Pontanus, Georgius Bartholdus, above. SUTCLIFFE, MATTHEW (1550?–1629). P. De concionum ad populum formulis. London 1602 (in De recta studii theologici ratione liber i).

THOMASSIN, LOUIS (1619–1695). R.C. A Latin version by himself of his 'La prédication,' Paris 1688 (in his Vetus et nova ecclesiae disciplina). Lucca 1728. In original French: Paris 1678–79, 1717, 1725 (Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'église).

WOLZOGEN, LODEWIJK VAN (1632–1690). P. Orator sacer, sive de ratione concionandi. Utrecht 1671.

ZANUS, CELSUS, O.M. R.C. De rhetorica et poetica ecclesiastica et civili. Rome 1643. ZEIDLER, MELCHIOR (1630–1686). P. Rhetorica ecclesiastica. Koenigsberg 1672–1680, 1704.

Eighteenth Century

ALEXANDER, NATALIS, O.P. (1639–1724). R.C. Institutio concionantium tripartita. Delft 1701, Paris 1702, Augsburg 1763. ANTONIUS, PAUL (1661–1730). P. Elementa homiletica. Halle 1707.

BAHRDT, JOHANN FRIEDRICH (d. 1775). P. Praecepta oratoriae sacrae. Leipsic 1752, 1757. BATIE, ANGELUS À LA. R.C.

Tractatus de rhetorica sacra. Florence 1799. BAUER, KARL LUDWIG (1730–1799). P. Rhetoricae Paullinae, vel quid oratorium sit in oratione Paulli. Halle 1782 (2 vols.). BONUCCI, ANTON-MARIA, S.J. (d. 1728 or 1729). R.C. Manuductio ad rhetoricen e severiori veterum oratorum disciplina et praesertim e sacris utrius linguae patribus . . . breviter deprompta. Rome 1703. BRAUSE, JOHANN KARL FRIEDRICH VON. P. De ministro eccles. Chr. predic. (sic Weigel 1234). Leipsic 1769. BREU, JOHANN. P. Dissertatio theologica de methodo concionandi Christi. Wittenberg 1724. BRÜNINGS, CHRISTIAN (1702–1763). P. Primae lineae studii homiletici. Frankfurt am Main 1744. BURGOS, ALEXANDER, O.M. (1666–1726). R.C. De usu et necessitate eloquentiae in rebus sacris tractandis. Rome 1710. BUSMAN, JOHANN CHRISTIAN (b. 1678). P. Collectio de professoribus eloquentiae doctoribus ecclesiae celeberrimis priorum quatuor post C. N. saeculorum. Helmstedt 1710. Technical?

CHLADENIUS (CHLADNI), MARTIN (1669–1725). P. Institutiones homileticae. Danzig 1732. CHRYSANDER, WILHELM CHRISTIAN JUSTUS (1718–1788). P. De notione et nucleo homiliarum. Kiel 1770.

DETHARDING, GEORG (1727–1813). P. Commentatio theologica de accommodatione verbi divini ministri ad captum vulgi. Göttingen 1782.

FABRICIUS, FRANCISCUS (1663–1738). P. Orator sacer. Leiden 1733. FILAMONDO, RAPHAEL MARIA DE, O.P. (d. 1715 or 1717). R.C. Theo-rhetoricae idea ex divinis scripturis et politioris literaturae mystagogis deducta, duobus tomis comprehensa, christianis oratoribus ad imitandum proposita. Naples 1700 (2 vols.). FRANCKE, AUGUST HERMANN (1663–1727). P. Epistola ad amicum de ratione concionandi cum uberiore auditorum fructu. Olim scripta Germanice jam in linguam Latinam conversa a Joanne Henrico Grischovio. Halle 1739. The original German letter was apparently never published. In English: 'A letter to a friend concerning the most useful way of preaching,' translated from the Latin by David Jennings, London 1740 (in Jennings, John: Two discourses . . . to which is added A letter concerning the most useful way of preaching . . . by A. H. Franck).

GASSMAYR, SEBASTIANUS, S.J. (d. 1768). R.C. Scientia eloquentiae sacrae et prophanae. Innsbruck 1756, 1772, Augsburg 1772. GISBERT, BLAISE, S.J. (1657–1731). R.C. A Latin version of his De l'éloquence chrétienne. Augsburg 1749, 1775; Ofen (Buda) 1757

(in Vincent Houdry, S.J., Bibliotheca concionatoria). In original French: Lyons 1702 (1st ed. under the title, Le bon goût de l'éloquence chrétienne), ibid. 1715, ibid. 1724–34 (in Houdry's Bibliothèque des prédicateurs, vol. xxii; Paris 1860, ibid. 1865–69 (in Houdry's Bibliothèque etc.). GOLDHAGEN, HERMANN, S.J. (1718–1794). R.C. Rhetorica explicata et adplicata ad eloquentiam civilem et ecclesiasticam maxime ad sacras conciones accommodata. Mainz and Frankfurt 1753, Bamberg 1772. GÖZ, CHRISTIAN GOTTLIEB (b. 1746). R.C. Tabula homiletica, seu conspectus regularum et conciliorum concionandi. Stuttgart 1777.

HARTITZSCH, JULIUS ALEXANDER AB (VON). P. De concione docimastica (Prob-Predigt). Wittenberg 1720. HEINE, SAMUEL GOTTLIEB (1683–1746). P. Praxis homiletica theoriae Rivinianae. Leipsic 1714. See Rivinus, above. HERMANN, ABRAHAM (d. 1705). Trecentifolium homileticum. Leipsic 1718. New ed. by Leonhard David Hermann. HILLIGER, JOANNES ZACHARIAS (1693–1770). P. Rhetorica ecclesiastica. Wittenberg 1729. HILLINGER, WALLFRIED (fl. 1770). R.C. Ars bene dicendi de suggestu ecclesiastico, seu rhetorica sacra. Augsburg 1770. HOCHSTETTER, ANDREAS ADAM (1668–1717). P. De recta concionandi ratione commentatio. Tübingen 1767 (3d ed. C. F. Sartorius); Stuttgart 1866. HOLLEBEEK, EWALD (1719–1796). P. Dissertatio theologica de optimo concionum genere. Leiden 1768, 1770. HOLST, LAURITS (1742–1824). P. De cultioris styli in orationibus sacris temperamento. Copenhagen 1774.

KAPRINAI, STEPHANUS, S.J. (1714–1786). R.C. Institutio eloquentiae sacrae generatim et speciatim ex veterum et recentiorum praeceptionibus adornatae. Kaschau in Hungary 1760 (2 vols.). KOENIGSMANN, ANDREAS LUDEWIG (1679–1728). P. Animadversiones homileticae. Kiel [1711]. KONARSKI, STANISLAUS HEIRONYMUS, Piar. (1700–1773). R.C. De emendandis eloquentiae vitiis. [Warsaw?] 1741 (Hurter v. 44). Includes a treatment of preaching? KRIGEL, ABRAHAM (d. 1759). P. De vitiis quae eloquentia sacra e scholis traxit. Leipsic 1740. KUGLER, JOSEPH (1736–1800). R.C. Principia practica de vita exemplari, praedicatione verbi, administratione sacramentorum, junioribus clericis usui futuro, ex variis auctoribus collecta. Amberg 178– (Kayser).

LAMPE, FREDERICUS ADOLPHUS (1683–1729). P. Methodus concionandi. Frankfurt am Main 1748. LANGE, JOACHIM (1670–1744). P. Oratoria sacra. Frankfurt am Main and Leipsic 1707, Halle

1713. LEIGH, JOHANN GEORG. P. Methodus concionandi eclectica. Jena 1719. LEONHARD, JOANNES CHRISTOPHORUS. P. Idea eloquentiae sacrae. Helmstedt 1708. LETINS, CONSTANTIN, O.M. (d. 1714). R.C. Theologia concionatoria. Liége 1710–1713 (5 vols.), Cologne 1726 (5 parts), Maastricht 1730 (3d ed.). Includes technical matter? LINDAHL, PETRUS. P. Circa eloquentiam ecclesiasticam. Uppsala 1794. LINDBERG, VILHELM (1704–1738). P. Observationes nonnullae circa requisita futuri homiletae. Copenhagen 1733.

MOLANDER, JOHANNES, and WINTER, A. H. P. De elocutione oratoris sacri. Åbo (Finland) 1784–1795 (2 vols.). MURSINNA, SAMUEL (1717–1795). P. Homiletica, seu de recta eloquentiae ecclesiasticae methodo libellus. Halle 1766.

NEIKTER, JAKOB FREDRIK (1744–1803). P. Dissertatio de eloquentia quae oratorem sacrum deceat. Uppsala [1787]. NICHT, GUIDO AB ANGELIS, Piar. (1709–1789). R.C. De praedicatione verbi divini. Leutomischl 1747; Kempten 1779. NORING, S. S. P. De necessitate eloquentiae in cathedra ecclesiastica. Uppsala 1742.

OELRICHS, JOHANN (1724–1801). P. Primae lineae institutionum homileticarum. Bremen 1770. OEYENBURCH, HENRICUS VAN, O.P. (d. 1715). R.C. Manuale concionatorum. Brussels 1708. Sermons; includes technical matter?

PFEIFFER, JOHANN GOTTLOB (1667–1740). P. Meditamenta homiletica. Leipsic 1733. Includes technical matter? PINGGIESSER, JOANNES JOACHIM. Hodegus homileticus. Jena 1719.

RANDRUP, NIELS (1716–1752). P. Modus applicandi regulas rethorices sacrae. Copenhagen 1736, 1738. REINHOLD, CHRISTIAN GOTTLIEB (d. 1785). P. De prudentia verbi divini ministri homiletica seu concionatoria. Mühlhausen in Thuringia 1767. RITMEIER, CHRISTOPH HEINRICH (1671–1719). P. De studio theologico atque homiletico. Helmstedt 1717. RØRDAM, CHRISTIAN BOLLE (1743–1802). P. De generalibus bonae concionis sacrae requisitis tractatus. Copenhagen 1768.

SANTA TERESA, Fr. JOÃO DE. R.C. Dissertatio de Evangelii praedicatione in Hispaniis (June 14, 1798). Coimbra. Univ. MS 735. SCHENK, HEINRICH TRAUGOTT (1765–1816). P. Delectus observationum homileticarum nostris maxime temporibus aptarum (accommodatus). Wittenberg 1791. SCHMID, JOHANN WIL-

HELM, 1744–1798. P. Disquisitio brevis praeceptorum partitionis homileticae. Jena 1783. Technical? SINDING, POUL CHRISTIAN (1748–1786). P. De iis quae ad materiam concionis sacrae pertinent. Copenhagen 1771. STOCK, CHRISTIAN (1672–1733). P. Institutiones homileticae. Jena 1721.

TELLER, ROMANUS (1703–1750). P. Institutiones homileticae. Leipsic 1748. TIL, SALOMON VAN (1643–1713). P. Methodus concionandi. Dordrecht 1688, Franecker 1712, Frankfurt 1717, Utrecht 1717.

UTTER, JOHANNES. P. De officio oratoris sacri in argumentis disponendis. Åbo (Finland) 1780–1781 (2 parts)

VILA, ANTONIO (1747–1820). R.C. De sacro christianae gentis oratore. Ferrara 1785–1786 (2 vols.). VITRINGA, CAMPEGIUS, the elder (1659–1722). P. Animadversiones ad methodum homiliarum ecclesiasticarum rite instituendarum. Franecker 1721, Jena 1722, 1729.

WEISSENBACH (VEISSENBACH), JOSEPH ANTON, S.J. (1734–1801). R.C. Ratio utendi scriptis sanctorum patrum ad conciones sacras. Rome 1825 (extracted from De eloquentia patrum libri xiii in usum ecclesiasticorum, Augsburg 1775 ff., 9 vols.). In German: Regensburg 1844 (in Beredsamkeit der Kirchenväter nach J. A. Weissenbach, tr. and ed. by Regens Nickel and Joseph Kehrein; vol. i: Homiletik aus den Werken der Kirchenväter gezogen).

WINTER, A. H. See Molander, above.

ZELLNER, VALERIANUS, O.S.A. (1718–1763). R.C. Rhetorica sacra, seu norma accurate et utiliter concionandi. Regensburg 1749.

Nineteenth Century

ANJOU, LARS ANTON (1803–1884). P. De notione concionum sacrarum. Uppsala 1840 (diss. theol.). ANONYMOUS. R.C. De rationibus eloquentiae sacrae principia selecta. Innsbruck 1861 (Kayser).

BOLOGNA, CARLO. R.C. De sacra eloquentia: oratio. Venice 1851. BOYSEN, NIC. P. De argumento concionum. Copenhagen 1805.

DANÈ, EMANUELE. R.C. De arte concionandi tractatus. Palermo 1879.

FACILIDES, VICTOR GOTTFRIED. P. De εὐκαιρίας homileticae observatione oratoribus sacris nostri temporis maximopere commendanda. Penig in Saxony 1830. FERRERI, GIOVANNI BATTISTA. R.C. Oratio de sacrorum oratorum eloquentia a sacris litteris praecipue haurienda. Padua 1843.

HENGEL, WESSEL ALBERTUS VAN (1779–1871). P. Institutio oratoris sacri. Leiden 1829. HEURLIN, SAMUEL (b. 1820). P. De dispositione homiletica dissertatio. Lund 1849.

LEONHARDI, GUSTAV (1826–1894). P. De sacrae eloquentiae natura et indole. Leipsic 1873. LEZAT, HADRIANUS (1832–1886). R.C. De oratore Christiano apud Sanctum Augustinum. Paris 1871.

MICHELETTI, ANTONIO MARIA. R.C. Epitome theologiae pastoralis (Vol. ii, Part 2 includes 'De sacris concionibus'). Turin 1925 (vol. i), 1929 (vol. ii).

ÖSTBERG, JACOB (b. 1811). P. Observationes homileticae. Uppsala 1840 (diss.).

PARK, CARL VILHELM (1808–1853). P. De ratione atque methodo dogmatice concionandi meditationes. Uppsala 1840 (diss.). PESCHECK, CHRISTIAN ADOLF (1787–1859). P. Homiletica Horatiana. Zittau and Leipsic 1840 (2d ed.). PETTERSON, JOHANNES (1795–1881). P. De Chrysostomo homileta. Lund 1833 (diss. theol.). POLCARIUS, INNOCENTIUS, S.J. (b. 1818). R.C. 'De eloquentia sacra.' Naples 1858, 1859 (2d ed.): Universae eloquentiae institutiones, Pt. v, Chap. 5.

ROSENFELD, DANIEL FRANZ. 1. Quid oratoribus sacris vicariis in orationibus suis tractandum sit ut eae quam maximum afferant utilitatem etc. Leipsic 1813. 2. Diss. de animi alacritate et hilaritate quacum orationes sacrae habendae sunt. Schneeberg 1808.

SCHAUMANN, FRANS LUDVIG (1810–1877). P. De ratione quae homileticam et catecheticam intercedit. Helsinki 1837 (diss.). SCHREITER, JOHANN CHRISTOPH (1770–1821). P. Commentatio de modo oratori sacro in movendis animis diligentius servando. Kiel 1815. SKULIK, BERNARDUS. R.C. Ars liberalis seu rhetorica politico-sacra. Siena 1898.

TAPFER, ANTON (1773–1835). R.C. Legitima concionandi methodus. Landshut 1836. TZSCHIRNER, HEINRICH GOTTLIEB (d. 1828). P. De claris oratoribus veteris ecclesiae. Leipsic 1829 (in Opuscula, ed. J. Fr. Winzer).

ZOBEL, JOHANN KARL HEINRICH VON. P. De oraculorum divinorum in concionibus sacris usu inepto eodemque noxio dissertatio inauguralis. Leipsic 1817.

Twentieth Century

BENEDICT XV, Pope (1854–1922). R.C. Littera encyclica de praedicatione divini verbi: Humani generis redemptionem. Rome 1917 (in Acta Apostolicae Sedis: Commentarium officiale ix. 305–317). In Dutch: Brussels 1917. In French: ibid. 1917. In Italian: Ravenna 1917.

CONSISTORIALE. SACRA CONGREGATIO. R.C. Sacra congregatio consistorialis: Normae pro sacra praedicatione (June 28, 1917). Rome 1917 (in Acta Apostolicae Sedis: Commentarium officiale ix. 328–334). Ibid. 1938 (excerpt in Enchiridion clericorum, pp. 530–531).

PIUS X, Pope (1835–1914). R.C. Litterae encyclicae 'Acerbo nimis,' die 15 mensis Aprilis [MDCCCCV], ad sacros universi catholici orbis antistites, de christiana doctrina tradenda. Rome 1907 (Pii X Pontificis Maximi acta. ii 69–84).

MONASTICS AND SECULARS UNDER YAROSLAV THE WISE

In Cross's excellent translation of the Russian Primary Chronicle a misunderstanding in the famous passage describing Yaroslav's encouragement of religion and learning has obscured an historical point. Cross translates,

> "Thus Yaroslav, as we have said, was a lover of books and as he wrote many, he deposited them in the Church of St. Sophia which he himself founded. He adorned it with gold and silver and churchly vessels and in it the usual hymns are raised to God at the customary seasons. He founded other churches in the cities and districts, appointing priests and paying them out of his personal fortune. He bade them teach the people, since that is the duty which God has prescribed them and to go often into the churches. Priests and Christian laymen thus increased in number." [1]

The phrase *v neizhe obychnyya pyesni Bogu vzdayut v gody obychnyya* [2] should, however, not be rendered "and in it the usual hymns are raised to God at the customary seasons," but "in it the usual Offices are chanted to God at the customary hours." The first Greek equivalent for *god* in Micklosich's Lexicon Palaeoslovenico — Graeco — Latinum is ὥρα not καιρός and in a passage in the Pechershii Chronicle Mark, the grave-digger, returned to the monastery to bring a corpse and "found the whole community chanting the customary office over him" (*obryetye vsyu bratyu obychnoye pyenie nad nim svrshayushcha*).[3] The reference is obviously to the Office of the Dead.[4]

It should be noticed that throughout the account of Yaroslav there is a clear distinction observed between monks (chernoriztse), secular clergy (popy, prosvuteri), and the laity (lyudi c̄hryyany). The meaning of the passage quoted above is evidently that the clergy of the metropolitan Church of St. Sophia recited the Office regularly. The parochial clergy, who were paid out of Yaroslav's pocket, were sent to

[1] S. H. Cross, The Russian Primary Chronicle, Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature xii, Cambridge, 1930, p. 226.

[2] Polnoe Sobraniye russkich letopisei I. 1, 2 ed., Leningrad, 1926, col. 153.

[3] V. Yakovlev, Pamyatniki russkoi literatury xii i xiii vekov, St. Petersburgh, 1872, p. clix.

[4] E. Golubinskii, Istoriya russkoi tserkvi I. 2, Moscow, 1904, p. 453.

the towns and country districts where Christianity had yet to gain a firm hold. These were urged to attend church regularly, presumably because they did not feel the obligation of the divine office so keenly.[5]

[5] E. Golubinskii, I. 2, p. 348.

R. P. Casey

Brown University

BOOKS RECEIVED

L'Ascese Monastique de Saint Basile. *Par David Amand.* Maredsous, Editions de Maredsous, 1948. 364 p.

Das Christentum: Eine Geoffenbarte Religion. *Von Jean Boisset.* Tübingen, Mohr. 1948. 45 p.

Études de Critique et d'Histoire Religieuses. Lyon, Facultés Catholiques, 1948. 137 p.

Experience Trinitaire et Vision Beatifique D'Après Saint Jean de la Croix. *Par Pierre Blanchard.* [Tiré à part de l'Année Theologique 1948 (fasc. IV, page 293–310)]

Hiwi Al-Balkhi, A Comparative Study. *By Dr. Judah Rosenthal.* Philadelphia, Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning. 1949. (no price).

Karl Barth L'Occasionalisme Théologique de Karl Barth. Étude sur sa Méthode Dogmatique. *Von Jérôme Hamer.* Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, 1949. (no price).

Kirche und Öffentlichkeit. *Von Helmut Thielicke.* Tübingen, Furche, [1947] DM 4.20.

Literature & Theology in Colonial New England. *By Kenneth B. Murdock.* Cambridge, Harvard University Press, [1949]. 235 p. $4.00.

Littérature Religieuse. Bible-Coran, Religions de L'Inde et de la Chine. Traduits et commentés *Par Jean Steinmann* and others, Paris, Colin, 1949. 843 p. 1400 fr.

Le Livre des Combats de L'Ame. *Par Albert Caraco.* Paris, Boccard, 1949. 235 p. (no price).

Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae. Vol. I. De Revelatione Christiana — De Ecclesia Christi — De Fontibus Revelationis. *By J. M. Hervé.* Paris, Berche et Pagis, 1949. 626 p. (no price).

Missions and the American Mind. *By Kenneth Scott Latourette.* Indianapolis, National Foundation Press, 1949. $1.00.

Paul and the Twelve. [*By N. Ivanov* (?). Davisburg, Mich.] n.d. 24 p. free.

La Prière des Églises de Rite Byzantin. Les Fêtes. La Cathiste, La Quinzaine de Pâques, L'Ascension et la Pentecôte. *Par le R.P.E. Mercenier.* Belgique, Monastère de Chevetogne, [1948]. 502 p. 150 fr.

Problemas y Methodos de la Investigacion en Historia de la Filosofia. *Par Rodolfo Mondolfo.* Tucamán, Argentina, Universidad Nacional de Tucamán, 1949. 222 p.

Studien zum Dritten Kapitel des Lukasevangeliums. *By Harold Sahlin.* Uppsala, Leipzig, Lundequistska, Harrasowitz, 1949. 147 p. 150 fr.

PRINTED AT THE HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRINTING OFFICE
CAMBRIDGE, MASS., U.S.A.

Classic literature is always modern

THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY

THE great literature of the Greeks and Romans has remained alive throughout the centuries because of the deeply satisfying pleasure it has given to each new generation of readers. The *Odyssey* of Homer, the poems of Ovid, the philosophy of Plato, the adventures of Aeneas — these are old friends of the classroom. But many other books, by both familiar and less well-known authors, provide reading as stimulating today as it was two thousand years ago. The witty dialogues of Lucian, the brilliant comedies of Aristophanes, the travels of Strabo, and the botanical discoveries of Theophrastus, founder of modern botany, are only samples of the wide range of subjects included in the LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY of over 360 titles.

In the LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY the original Greek or Latin text is printed on left-hand pages with a line-for-line translation on facing pages. Write for a descriptive catalogue. The price is uniformly $2.50 a volume.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
CAMBRIDGE 38 , , , MASSACHUSETTS